1-1-1970

# Feasibility study of a performance-based teacher education curriculum in language arts.

Masha Kabakow Rudman
*University of Massachusetts Amherst*

# FEASIBILITY STUDY OF A PERFORMANCE-BASED TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN LANGUAGE ARTS

A Dissertation Presented

By

Masha Kabakow Rudman

Submitted to the Graduate School of the

University of Massachusetts in

partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1970

Major Subject Teacher Education

FEASIBILITY STUDY OF A PERFORMANCE-BASED

TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM IN

LANGUAGE ARTS

A Dissertation

By

Masha Kabakow Rudman

Approved as to style and content by:

James M. Cooper
(Chairman of Committee)

(Head of Department)

(Member)

David J. Young
(Member)

(Member)

May 1970
(Month) (Year)

THIS WORK IS DEDICATED WITH GRATITUDE TO

SY, RACHEL BETH, REVA, AND DEBBIE

for supporting
and enduring

JIM, DAVID, AND DAN

for guiding

EILEEN, BETTY, AND MARGARET

for toiling

MARY ALICE

for being

TABLE OF CONTENTS

## LIST OF TABLES

# CHAPTER I

## INTRODUCTION

### History of the Study

The curriculum in a teacher education program traditionally includes methods courses which are planned and presented in accordance with the interests, expertise, sincere opinions, whims, and/or needs of the individual instructor. In a methods course in language arts, some instructors might, for example, be particularly interested or knowledgeable in the area of linguistics, or in the use of the basal eclectic approach to teaching reading or in the philosophy and methodology of the individualized reading approach. Each of these instructors, therefore, might emphasize his area of interest over any other in the course he teaches. Students in these courses could emerge with widely disparate abilities and areas of knowledge and no minimum base of competence. In this situation, an instructor could generally evaluate a portion of the student's proficiency by means of tests, and sometimes, through observations. But usually the instructor would know what he, the instructor, had "covered," and not necessarily what the student had assimilated, or what the student could do.

One of the advantages of this kind of program is that the student can receive the benefit of the instructor's enthusiasms and expertise. But this form of education places a great burden upon the individual instructor. All (or almost all) inspiration, motivation and instruction must come from him. This procedure operates under the implied if not explicit premise that the student learns best by whatever means the teacher selects as the instructional approach. This pro-

cedure is in danger of contributing to the assumption that there is one and only one best way of teaching a particular body of knowledge, if only because, as Bandura (1965) pointed out, students model their future behavior on the perceived behavior of their teachers, even if the teachers do not intend that this particular set of behaviors be copied.

Until September of 1969, the program of language arts education at the University of Massachusetts' School of Education was much like that of most other schools of education, that is, basically conforming to the above described model. The reading and language arts program concentrated heavily on perpetuating the traditional basal, group approach to the teaching of reading. Students were encouraged to "read the manuals carefully," and to follow the directions therein as methodically and obediently as possible. All students were required to attend class regularly; attendance was generally checked and recorded. Assignments were made to each section of students by each individual instructor. Classes and instructional methods varied only according to which professor was in charge of the section. They each contained approximately thirty students, and met for three sessions a week, two hours per session, for a total of eight weeks. When the students practice-taught, they went to school systems that used the same methodology: the same methodology with which they had been taught as children; the same methodology with which they had been taught as students of educational methodology. Very few students expressed the desire to create or participate in a new kind of educational environment. Nor at the time were there many available school

systems experimenting with innovations in content, structure or methodology. In the past two years the situation has changed: students have more opportunities for internship and eventual positions in innovative settings because more and more public and private schools in western Massachusetts have begun experimenting with new curricula, organization and approaches in the teaching of elementary language arts.

In March, 1968, the School of Education was awarded a grant by the Bureau of Research, U.S. Office of Education to plan a performance-based elementary teacher education program. The title of the grant was "A Model Elementary Teacher Education Program," henceforth abbreviated METEP. One of the task forces established for this study was given the responsibility of examining and planning the elementary teacher education program in the content field of language arts. This writer was the chairman of the component. The goals of this component were compatible with the goals of the entire program, particularly to prepare teachers for change, to develop performance criteria, to make the program both individualized and relevant, to provide for continuous and ongoing diagnosis and evaluation, and to develop multiple learning opportunities for each educational objective (Allen and Cooper, 1968).

In addition to the goals shared with the overall program, the language arts component based its work during and after the planning phase on the assumption that communication was its prime focus, and that the future teacher's prime concern should be the development and improvement of his own and his students' ability to communicate. The task force decided that since it is necessary for an individual to be

able to freely communicate information, ideas, attitudes and emotions effectively, commensurate with today's and tomorrow's needs and developments, it was important that techniques of communication such as non-verbal cues, use of new technological developments and simultaneous use of multiple media be incorporated into curricula for the education of children and of future teachers. There was no intent to dispute the effectiveness of books and other printed materials for use in reading, or records, tapes and traditional classroom verbal activities for speaking and listening, or, for that matter, typewriters, pens, pencils, and paper for writing. It was recognized that traditionally successful media need not be ignored or discarded, but that their use must be maintained only when relevant and applicable and selected as such from a large range of other available media. The task force further came to certain conclusions about what to emphasize in the language arts teacher education program. It viewed the teacher as a decision maker, facilitator, instigator, innovator and learner, as well as disseminator of information. The program was designed with these functions in mind. Since these functions imply observable behaviors, and since the stipulation of performances was one of the important goals of METEP, the decision was made to base the entire language arts curriculum on the learner's expected performance rather than on topics for the instructor to "cover." Added to this was the charge of providing many alternative learning routes for attaining each performance. Cronbach's (1967) concept of educational goals with different instructional treatments and adaptations to meet individual needs was considered important by the task force although it was agreed to

make no attempt at prescription of learning opportunities for specific learners. Provision was made for each learner to select from any options available, or to generate his own, if he so preferred. Allen and McDonald (1966) studied the effects of self-selection on learner success, and found no significant differences in performance between those learners who had self-selected, and those who had not. They urged further research in this area.

The task force specified approximately seventy performances in the final report (Allen and Cooper, 1968). These performances were derived, as Tyler (1950) recommended, from sources such as research studies in language arts content, studies of curriculum planning, feedback from schools (teachers, students and parents), and experts' opinions on the needs of society. Task force consultants included such experts as Terry Borton, Morton Botel, Benjamin DeMott, Kenneth Goodman, Ray Johnson, James Moffett and Gerald Weinstein. The task force recommended that flexibility and individualization be prime emphases. It reiterated that specific performance criteria or particular individual aspects of the program would always be open to change. Provision was made for the continuous incorporation of new techniques and ideas into the program. It was decided that data sources, particularly program participants, would be continuously consulted so as to build in constant re-evaluation.

A second METEP grant from the U.S. Office of Education was awarded the University of Massachusetts in May, 1969. This grant was to extend to January, 1970, and was for the purpose of testing the pedagogical managerial and economic feasibility of METEP as conceived in its planning stages. David Yarington and this writer were designated co-directors of this phase of the study. Mary Alice Wilson (1970) de-

signed and executed the evaluation of the study, which was conducted in the fall semester of 1969 with a student population of one hundred and eleven.

## Philosophical and Psychological Rationale

The two significant factors involved in the feasibility study were the specification of performances for the students to master and the provision of multiple avenues of instruction for each of the performances, which the student could self-select according to his own needs and preferences. Other aspects of the program such as the ideas that the program serve as a model for the future procedures to be utilized in public schools and that significant subject matter be imparted were not substantially different from previous teacher education approaches. There was no intention of suggesting that the "methods" instructor abdicate all responsibility for advising or aiding the student. Rather, the attempt was made to create a situation such as Ericksen (1967) described where many materials for instruction, such as books, machines, audio-visual materials and computers, would be available to the learner and where people of all sorts could interact with the learner. Ericksen further suggested the necessity of making better use of the ability the student has for independent learning by conferring upon him a measure of responsibility for providing himself with much of his needed information. Siegel (1967) observed that Ericksen viewed the instructor as only one means out of many available for the end of furthering the learning process. He did not suggest that the teacher's role is unimportant, but rather placed

him alongside other valuable learning aids. He did, however, state that it is the variables centered in the student himself which are the most crucial factors in the learning process. He therefore concluded that the most appropriate instructional environment is one that takes these factors into consideration. Ausubel (1967) agreed and added the reflection that we sometimes lose sight of the fact that the goal we seek is not teaching, but the facilitation of learning. Ausubel also presented the reader with several of Smith's (1960) hypotheses, based on the premise that teaching is only one of the conditions influencing learning, and that it may neither be sufficient, nor even necessary for some learners. Smith observed that some students learned without being taught, that is, by teaching themselves. His hypotheses, therefore, were that learning and teaching do not necessarily depend on each other, that a theory of learning does not include a theory of pedagogy and that teaching is not the same as telling. Bruner (1966) concluded that the effective curriculum would include different sequences, different experiences and different approaches all leading to the same general goal. Rogers (1967) added that the process of change, and the involvement in this process, as well as the realization on the part of the learner of how he is learning are most essential goals for today's education, and are most suitable for the world now. Thus Rogers questioned several assumptions underlying much current educational practice, including the implications that students cannot be trusted to pursue their own learning and that passive learners develop into creative citizens. The METEP language arts feasibility study operated on the assumption that the

learner can be trusted to pursue his own learning, and indeed must be an active learner if he is to encourage his students, when he is a teacher, to pursue their own learning. Siegel (1967), in summarizing contemporary viewpoints on instruction, discovered that there was general consensus that the needs of our society require active participation on the part of the learner as well as an involvement in the process of his learning. Siegel found that none of the contributors to his volume of readings accepted the model of the learner as a passive recipient. He added that most of the writers of contemporary instructional points of view recommended the provision of many parallel learning situations rather than the concentration upon a search for better or best learning environments. The writers urged diversity and multiplicity of both means and ends in education. Although Gagne' (1967, p. 296) might appear to have differed from this point of view when he stated that "the function of instruction is the control of the external conditions of the learning situation," thus implying a strong degree of teacher control, he nevertheless added that it is important to consider the idea of self-instruction as an aim, not simply as a technique of education. He stated (p. 313) that "this may be the direction of practical development which could best exploit the unique contribution of the individual learner."

The language arts study fully subscribed to the philosophy of having the learner make decisions and assume responsibility for a large portion of his own learning. As stated previously, the ultimate aim was to have students in the program transfer this process to their own students, especially within the content area of language arts. Joyce (1967,

p. 7) strongly endorsed the multiple learning option route:

> A truly vigorous personal, intellectual, and social education can be created only if the teacher and the student, as they work together, have many options available to them--options which enable students to engage in a large variety of instructional activities and which assist teachers to perform a corresponding diversity of instructional roles.

Joyce's mention of diverse instructional roles implied diverse sets of behaviors on the part of teachers. Siegel (1967) noted that most of the authors in his volume of readings emphasized teacher behaviors. Gagne' (1967) pointed out the extreme importance of the learners prior understanding of what kind of performance is expected of him when he is considered to have learned something. These statements in no way contradict what has been affirmed before: that the learner must make decisions in terms of how and what he learns. Once he has made these choices, his learning is clarified and enhanced if he can define the behaviors he can then be expected to perform. The behavioral outcomes which we expected of the learners taking part in the program were outlined in the study as performance criteria. These performances were designed to be specific enough so that assessment could be made of whether or not the learner had achieved the stated goals, but open enough so as to permit a wide range of individual differences. The writer of this study agreed with Cooper (1967) and Gagne' (1964) that task analysis or instructional objectives specifying effective behaviors, but probably requiring different learning conditions, would be an efficient procedure for education. According to Taba (1962) and Tyler (1950), specification of objectives in terms of behaviors is crucial for effective curriculum construction. Tyler's

(1964) point that clearly stated objectives help the student understand what he is trying to learn as well as provide some basis for his assessing what he has already learned was accepted as valid for the study. He also stressed (1964, p. 82) "determining behaviors... that the pupil can carry out so that when he has done this he will have a feeling for the open-endedness of the situation." Eisner (1967) agreed that the trend in curriculum development has been in favor of the specification of learning objectives, but he argued that this practice can hinder instructional goals as much as help them because of the danger that specified objectives will remain in a program, unexamined and unamenable to larger, important goals. Eisner questioned the feasibility of specific objectives in creative areas. He raised the issue of how a teacher forms insights into curriculum and pleaded for a variety of processes to be utilized in curriculum construction. Eisner's arguments (p. 279) included the belief that a distinction needed to be made between "defining an objective and establishing a direction, . . . and between open and closed objectives." He continued to develop this viewpoint (1969) when he suggested that the performance of certain activities which were educational ends in and of themselves be designated as expressive objectives. The METEP language arts study included expressive objectives as well as task analyses, or instructional objectives stated in terms of learner behaviors. The study also followed Taba's (1962) suggestion that performances be stated in such an open-ended manner as to permit various procedures and materials to be used by the learner.

Popham (1969, p. 37) stipulated that "A properly stated behavioral

objective must describe without ambiguity the nature of learner behavior or product to be measured." He agreed with Tyler (1950), however, that the most important aspect of an objective is that it determine whether or not there has been a change in the learner's behavior. The METEP performances were stated with this prime aim in mind. In addition, Eisner's (1967) fear that unexpected outcomes would be overlooked in curriculum planning if all outcomes were to be specified in advance was taken into consideration, and a constant re-evaluation and restatement of performance criteria were built into the program. (For further explication of this procedure, see Wilson, 1970). Bloom's (1956) and Krathwohl's (1964) classification of educational goals strongly influenced the construction of the ability and attitude goals of the METEP language arts study. Mager (1968) greatly clarified and furthered the use of the performance-based curriculum. He suggested that the steps involved in specifying objectives should include an identification of the activities a student might be observed doing if the objectives were accomplished as well as identification of practices that would help the student achieve the objective. Mager also made the point that learning must be used after instruction has been completed. Mager's discussion of the problem of avoidance behavior led to the decision to offer the METEP language arts performance criteria on a pass, no-record basis. That is, students were not permitted to "fail" a performance criterion and never attempt it again; it was mandatory that they maintain contact with the content of the educational objective until they had mastered it. Thus, the danger of a student's total avoidance of and therefore continued negative response to an area was decreased. A student's

final encounter with any given objective was always a successful one. Mager (p. 58) supplied a list of conditions which he termed "universal positives" which he considered to lead to successful learning experiences. The METEP language arts feasibility study employed those which were pertinent to the learner-population and content used in the study. Some practices conforming to Mager's specifications were the constant and immediate feedback by raters to learners, evaluation of students' work in private sessions rather than in class, provision of objectives and criteria for their success, provision of many options in terms of conditions, pacing, and sequencing of learning, provision of multiple instructional opportunities directly pertinent to the required performances, and ongoing opportunity for the learners to suggest improvements in the program. The program thus followed Openshaw's (1965) recommendation that a program of teacher education should provide for its own systematic improvement, while concentrating on teaching behavior and teaching performance as the focal point.

# CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Chapter one contained a review of the literature providing a rationale for the use of performance criteria and multiple instructional alternatives in the language arts study. In chapter two the literature relevant to curriculum research and methodology, the use of multi-media techniques, and teacher education approaches pertinent to this study will be presented. The attempt has been made to emphasize recent investigations, with the realization, nevertheless, that a historical perspective must be maintained. The research done in the content of language arts will be presented in chapters three and four in conjunction with the rationale for each performance criterion used in the study.

Wallen and Travers (1963) offered a classification of the present sources used for determining teachers' patterns of behavior. They posited that tradition, or the way in which the teacher was taught, was a powerful consideration. The teacher's social background, his own needs, conditions existing in the school and community, and, sometimes, philosophical traditions and scientific research on learning were influential forces on a teacher's methodology. They cited studies indicating that teacher education programs affected the attitudes of the future teachers. They made a plea for teacher education to be based on the learning principles of reinforcement of achievement of educational objectives, motivations to achieve them, practice in problem solving, individualization of the learning experience commensurate with the learner's ability, modeling, and experiencing. These principles, as well as those described in chapter one were taken into consideration for the METEP language arts curriculum.

Tyler's (1950) rationale for curriculum construction was used as the basis for this study. He advocated consulting three sources for constructing curriculum: subject matter, society, and the learner. For the METEP language arts study the most recent advances and results of research were investigated to form the basis for the content. Chapter one cites the references used as sources for making decisions concerning society's needs in the future. The learner was used as a data source, not only for the feasibility study, but also for the follow-up study. Tyler (1964) also suggested means for continuing to develop the curriculum which were adopted by the METEP language arts study. He recommended that a feedback process be used constantly to re-examine goals and objectives and to re-define, modify, and clarify them as part of the process of continuous curriculum building. Bruner (1966) concurred with this idea. He described the construction of curriculum as a process that must be guided by its evaluation. Openshaw (1965) criticized most teacher education programs for their inability to insure their own systematic modification in the light of new information and evaluative feedback. The concept of utilizing information collected from all of the participants in the program to affect the operation of the entire system was incorporated into the METEP model as a solution to the problem referred to by Openshaw.

Tyler's suggestions of data sources for selecting educational objectives were utilized. During the METEP planning study the over-all behavior, conditions under which the behaviors were to occur, and criteria of acceptable performances were included, as Mager (1962) had specified. But as the study progressed, it was recognized that to test the feasibility of the approach, Taba's (1962) advice that objectives be (p. 203)

"developmental, representing roads to travel rather than terminal points" should be considered in the formulation of objectives. Taba also stated (p. 197) that "the chief function of the more specific platform of objectives is to guide the making of curriculum decisions on what to cover, what to emphasize, what content to select, and which learning experiences to stress." It was with this in mind that the feasibility PCs were stated. Lindvall added to the process by summarizing criteria for stating objectives: They must be worded in terms of the learner, rather than the content or the teacher; they must include specifically what the learner is expected to do. He further differentiated between learning experiences and educational objectives. In the METEP study the learning experiences were presented as options for the students, but the PCs, which measured the achievement of educational objectives, were required. Tyler (1964) added that content should be linked with behavior in specifying objectives. He also suggested that each of the objectives be screened philosophically and psychologically. The major elements of concepts, skills and values were incorporated into a taxonomy of teaching skills which constituted the general objectives of the program (see table I). Each PC then represented the evaluation of specific skills within the content area. Taba (1962) recommended this procedure for organizing objectives. Ammerman et al. (1966) raised the question of terminal and enabling objectives. Mager (1962) defined "terminal" objectives as simply the behavior the learner was expected to achieve at the conclusion of the program. Ammerman concurred, but added that they merely constituted a critical, early step in preparing an instutional program.

In the opinion of this writer, the terminal objectives of teacher education are those exhibited by the learner when he is a teacher in his own classroom, since the ultimate goal of the program is to affect teaching behavior. Therefore, enabling objectives, or the learning difference between where the student is, and where one wants him to be, are the objectives formulated for a teacher education program. Whether terminal or enabling, they constituted the educational objectives of the study, and were based, as stated, on all of the above-mentioned experts' advice.

Bellack (1969) compiled a review of the history of curriculum and traced the ascendance of the practice of utilizing instructional objectives in the curriculum. Goodlad (1969) reviewed the state of the field at the present time and reported that substantial progress has been made in stating and using educational objectives with precision. He pointed out that Tyler's (1950) work is the one most used by curriculum constructors. Gagne' (1964) also credited Tyler with influencing the emphasis on instructional objectives and cited in his chapter a number of studies using the approach. Dressel (1954), in particular, reported results of many such studies. McNeil (1969) reviewed the procedures for formulating instructional objectives using subject matter, society and the learner as data sources. The most influential works in terms of stating objectives, have been Tyler, Bloom (1956), Krathwohl (1964), Mager (1962), and Popham (1969). In addition, Eisner's (1967) and Ammons' (1964) dissenting studies and comments served, nevertheless, to aid the construction of goals.

Investigations were conducted dealing with the various conditions of learning, particularly those involving the learning environment and

the materials used in instruction. Lindvall (1964) noted that textbooks on curriculum, in particular those concerned with testing and evaluation, have placed strong emphasis on the importance of specifying objectives. Gagne' (1965) described eight kinds of learning tasks, each requiring different learning conditions. McKeegan (1968) listed six steps in developing an individualized instruction program. He included content analysis, statement of objectives in terms of student performances, development of a variety of instructional approaches, establishment of criterion levels of performance, and provision for feedback, evaluation, and revision. Watson (1968) agreed that many instructional resources and learning experiences are essential for achieving instructional objectives. Bolvin and Glaser (1968) discussed the problems of encouraging originality and concluded that different learning approaches either selectively assigned to the student or made available to him for his selection helped solve the dilemma. Briggs (1968) found that research with groups, using different kinds of instructional media, was helpful when dealing with individual learners' differences. He reported studies done by Cooper and Gaeth (1967) comparing audio and visual presentations, Rohwer and others comparing print and pictures, Snow, Tiffin, and Seibert (1965) comparing groups receiving live instruction with those viewing films. Fargo and others (1967) experimented with live versus TV administration of a picture vocabulary test. James (1962) examined preferences by airmen for taking lessons by either reading or attending lectures.

Many such studies have been conducted trying to determine the particular effectiveness of a specific approach with individual learners. Walberg (1968) found that the learner's aptitude and his learning envi-

ronment were the most important factors which contributed to his performance. Snow (1969) stated the purpose of aptitude-treatment interaction analysis (which is the process the above-cited studies utilized) as providing the basis for construction of new forms of aptitude measures as well as improving instructional outcomes. Cronbach and Snow (1969) indicated that there is little evidence as demonstrated in their own research or in others' that aptitude and treatment matching has been successful. But they as well as all of the other researchers advocated a commitment to this area.

Not everyone agreed that the kind of instruction was the primary factor in influencing learning. Carroll (1963), for example, specified that the amount of time spent on the act of learning was the most contributing factor. Bloom (1968) supported Carroll's hypothesis, but added that other contributing factors, one of which was a great variety of instructional materials and procedures needed to be considered. He and Allen (1968) listed approximately the same conditions for effectively individualizing instruction: flexibility in time for learning, permission for cooperative student learning (rather than competitive), participation at different levels of commitment or depth, student selection of alternatives (including which instructors might be most effective), different instructional alternatives, and opportunities for varying group structures, ranging from the tutorial to large group. The METEP language arts study incorporated all of the above recommendations into its program.

Meierhenry (1968) asserted that materials were, indeed, a very important consideration for success in learning. He further posited that the learner could select from a variety of resources those which would be

most effective for him. Thelen (1965) suggested specific materials for the promotion of inquiry and thinking, and Popham (1969) found that the most effective curriculum projects in terms of educational practice were those from which curriculum materials were produced. Joyce (1967, p. 7) maintained that learning options were the key to "a truly vigorous personal, intellectual, and social education" and that these learning options must include a large variety of instructional resources as well as the provision for diverse instructional roles for the teacher.

Media was investigated and utilized in many studies, not only for its pertinence to instructional objectives, but also for its relevance to individualization of instruction. Edling (1968) extensively explored studies of application of media to educational objectives and cited many studies dealing with stating objectives, analysis of objectives, media and learner responses, and instructional strategies. He concluded (p. 189) that,

> there is considerable evidence to indicate that research and development activities involving media have (a) helped clarify educational objectives, (b) contributed to the analysis and design of media that produce the specific learner behaviors identified, (c) utilized learner responses to refine and develop more predictable learning experiences, (d) clarified the need for specific instructional strategies to attain given objectives, and (e) provided new potentiality to determine whether or not educational objectives have been attained.

Woodruff (1967) concluded that the entire curriculum should be presented in the form of media for presentation and defined media as (p.88) "a facile sensory language capable of delivering the phenomena in the curriculum to students in a form which facilitates perceptual input." Schramm (1964) listed nearly one hundred and ninety original reports in programmed instruction, most of which dealt with the selection of media

for learning experiences. Lumsdaine and May (1965), in their treatment of over one hundred experimental studies dealing with variables of presentation, noted a trend toward product testing in terms of effectiveness. Briggs and others (1967) suggested a procedure by which media options are developed at the same time as the behavioral objectives are specified. But in considering all of the innovations in media, Black (1968) concluded that it would be erroneous to assume that the textbook has lost its importance in learning. He affirmed that the textbook remains the basis for curriculum. Oettinger (1968) also questioned the validity of technology in curriculum, but most investigators, including MacLennan and Reid (1964), found that more and more media are being utilized and studied in education. They saw promise in the combination of programmed instruction, television, and filmed instruction and hoped for a coordination and integration of the most pertinent types of media. The same authors (Reid and MacLennan, 1967) reviewed more extensive categories of media research and predicted that rather than attempting to find the "best" method of instruction, educators would turn to a wide variety of learning situations. The use of media has been of interest to educators for some time. This interest is increasing, and more and more research projects are being conducted.

Householder (1968) reviewed approximately one hundred studies in techniques and modes of instruction and was encouraged by this attention to such an important area of instruction. Finn (1968) presented sources of present concern in education which point to the use of technology. He listed population expansion with the concomitant result of fewer teachers and more learners as one indicator of the necessity for new educational

arrangements. He added that the amount of new information that needs to be taught required more learning in less time. He also asked for better use of the newly developed technology. Finn provided a short historical background of media in education as a basis for his conception of present concerns. He emphasized the role of the universities in implementing the needed advances in media and technology.

In their review of media in conjunction with teacher education, Schueler and Lesser (1967) reported many studies. They observed that teachers tend to teach as they have been taught and postulated that if media were used to teach them, they would use media in their classes. The authors expressed the hope that more research would be conducted, leading to valid generalizations. Openshaw (1965), criticizing the traditional teacher education programs, discussed the gaps in professional preparation when the content of courses was contrasted with the emerging knowledge about the field of education. He suggested that many means be used to educate teachers so that they in turn might make appropriate selections of methods for handling persons, subjects or substances. Openshaw strongly supported the formulation of sets of educational objectives as well as performance skills. He urged the development of a taxonomy of teaching performance skills and teacher behaviors. All of the studies on teacher education which this writer consulted emphasized the individualization of instruction. McCracken (1968) recommended guidelines for in-service education that could pertain as well to pre-service. He stressed individualization and tailoring of the program to the personnel. Wallen and others (1969) were representative of the trend

of many programs to train teachers to prepare specific objectives. Jenkinson (1968) reported the emphasis on pre-service education programs for spearheading the many needed educational reforms in the field of reading. Her report concentrated on the current developments in teacher education, reading, and implications for training reading teachers. She discussed the many roles a teacher must fulfill to be a success in the classroom, and urged that a process of self-awareness be built into teacher education programs. LaGrone (1964) presented a proposal for teacher education using instructional units which appropriately utilized new media for teaching the professional curriculum. His guidelines were based on major behavioral objectives, an organized statement of content experiences, and multi-media instruction among others.

In sum, the literature pointed to the pressure upon teacher education institutions to equip their students with the abilities to formulate educational objectives using appropriate sources, to devise or utilize many different instructional approaches for meeting the objectives, and to consider the individual learner at all times.

# CHAPTER III

# THE FEASIBILITY STUDY

## Goals

The goals of the feasibility study included the acquisition of knowledge, attitudes and skills on the part of the learner, as Mager (1968) recommended. Emphasis was placed on openness to all approaches, new and old, in the area of language arts, with the assumption that this openness would carry over to the other curricular areas and would lead to an expansion of the candidate's repertoire of presentation skills. With the development of a willingness to try new and different approaches it was hoped that the students would realize that there is no exclusive solution to any educational problem, but rather that there are a number of viable alternative routes. From participation in the program should also have come an awareness of the candidate's own learning and teaching style, including pacing, sequence, and environment, and the concomitant understanding that one learning or teaching style is not superior to another. The program further sought to encourage the learner to recognize his own variety of preferences for materials and approaches. Taba (1962) has pointed out that some students learn more easily from reading a book that they have selected, or which has been recommended for them, than from a lecture, while it is exactly the reverse for other students. Some prefer looking at a television presentation; others prefer a live demonstration to any form of technical media. Some need a combination of presentations; the permutations are endless. It was likely that before entering the program, some students were unaware that they had a particular learning preference or were ignorant of the fact that not everyone shared their

particular predilection. In sum, the program aimed at developing the students' attitudes toward learning and teaching styles as follows: self-awareness of preferences, acceptance of the validity of others; willingness to attempt more than one (even if this implies taking a risk), and commitment to seek and use them in multiplicity.

Since this study stressed what teachers should be able to do in the context of the language arts, the goals included the abilities it was hoped students would attain. Broad categories of abilities were defined and later served as the basis for formulating the specific performance criteria. The abilities were presented as a hierarchy or taxonomy of teaching skills. That is, they progress from the simple to the complex with the assumption that each higher level depends upon the accomplishment, at least minimally, of the previous ones.

Krathwohl (1964) discussed the relevance of a taxonomy when constructing curriculum and recommended its use. Gagne' (1964, p. 39) affirmed that

> When one sets out to identify capabilities, the suggestion made by the evidence, early in the game, is that these capabilities are arranged in a hierarchy. One depends upon another, in the sense that learning any one capability usually depends upon the previous learning of some other simpler one. In fact, this may be one of the most important generalizations one can make about human learning.

Bloom (1956) recommended that knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis and evaluation constitute the classification headings within a cognitive taxonomy. The language arts study utilized Bloom's list in composing its hierarchy of teaching abilities. The first level specified that the student should be able to demonstrate proficiency in the language

arts. That is, the student should be able to listen, speak, read, and write at a level commensurate with his educational placement, or his pedagogical needs.

The second level specified that a good teacher should be able to demonstrate the ability to analyze within the language arts which skills an act requires and whether or not these skills are necessarily sequential. In other words, the candidate was expected to demonstrate a knowledge of the process of each of the areas within the language arts. The third level aimed at the ability to assess a student's level of development and to diagnose his skills needs, using both formal and informal procedures. The abilities to recognize strengths as well as needs, to communicate this information to the student, and to keep the entire procedure continuous rather than sporadic were included in this level. This set of abilities may be subsumed under one classification, that of the ability to diagnose. Cooper (1967) recognized the importance of this skill for teachers, as did Tyler (1964), and both advocated that methods diagnosis be included in the education of teachers. Level four was divided into two sections which dealt with multiple approaches and their selection. Taba (1962) urged that students acquire a wide range of learning techniques, not only for use in school, but after formal schooling.

Tyler concurred and added that the new developments which have been added to content fields should be examined with the aim of finding valuable approaches for students. Therefore, the final levels of the hierarchy consist of first having the student demonstrate a knowledge of the variety of approaches and materials available to each area of the language arts, such as linguistic, phonic, basal, programmed, experience, individualized,

and initial teaching alphabet (i/t/a) materials for teaching reading, and second, having the student demonstrate the ability to select from the many available materials and approaches, or to generate new ones to satisfy the needs of the students. Taba (1962) expressed the opinion that varying expectations and varying pace were not as good solutions to the problem of satisfying the needs of a heterogeneous group of individuals as was providing a balanced variety in learning techniques. Cooper (1967, p. 7) pointed out that "The more alternatives [a teacher] has at his disposal, the more likely he is to be able to motivate students, find proper methods of individualizing instruction, or organize his instruction to most efficiently achieve his goals." To summarize the taxonomy: if a teaching candidate could demonstrate the ability to select or generate several appropriate approaches to satisfy a child's needs, the assumption could be made that he had a knowledge of different approaches, could diagnose a child's needs, had a knowledge of the process, and was, himself, able to perform the specified act.

Goals of the study included those specified for the program itself. It was hoped that the program would provide an overview of the content of the elementary language arts curriculum, a structure for constant re-examination of the theoretical bases, content, and approaches in the language arts, as well as provide a model for the learner's future behavior. It was also hoped that the program would permit the participant to achieve a number of unspecified but probable behaviors, such as: pace his own learning appropriately (there was no specification of guidelines for pacing the performances), experiment with different learning environments and materials, generate new approaches for his own learning, and develop

a particular interest in the language arts, leading to a more than general competence in the area.

## Overview of the Curriculum

Although seventy performances were specified in the planning study, and it was foreseen that many more performances would be generated for the eventual full operation of the program, it was decided, because of considerations of time, economics, and experts' opinions, that for the purposes of the feasibility study twenty-eight criteria would be used. These twenty-eight encompassed all areas of the language arts with the exception of grammar. Moffett's (1968) view that grammar should never be separated from the other areas of the language arts, but should be incorporated appropriately into reading, writing, speaking, and listening activities was influential in this decision. The areas of the hierarchy constituted the general educational objectives for the study; each performance criterion (henceforth abbreviated PC) contained the specific evaluative procedures within each sub category of the language arts. The PCs were revised for the follow-up study, and were designed to be revised and expanded each semester.

Mary Alice Wilson designed and conducted the evaluation of the feasibility and follow-up studies for this program. (Wilson, 1970) She requested specific feedback from each of the participants (raters, students, and this writer) on each PC and instructional alternative, as well as on the overall program. This feedback, which was incorporated into the systems design of the overall program, was used throughout the progress of both studies, and is planned to be used as long as the METEP model is in effect. The general objectives remained the same for both studies.

Each PC fell within the domain of at least one level of the hierarchy (see Table I).

In September 1969 students were provided with a copy of the twenty-eight PCs which they were expected to complete by the end of the semester. They also received a packet describing the managerial process of the program (Wilson, 1970) including a schedule of lectures, forms which had to be filled out, and pertinent dates, locations, and information. Although PCs were listed in clusters according to content and lectures were offered in a different, chronological order, students were encouraged to organize their own sequence for attempting the PCs. The written listing began with an examination of the different approaches to the teaching of reading (PCs 1-12), with the basal eclectic materials first (1-4) because of their widespread use in this country, "in some 95 percent of our primary grades and in 88 percent of the middle grades" (Huck, 1967, p. 237). PCs dealing with reading skills, particularly those of word analysis and comprehension (5-7), followed. The next six PCs considered other reading approaches in varying degrees of depth (8-12), and PCs 13-21 tested whether or not candidates could devise different kinds of activities for the various language arts and design these activities with a specific student population in mind. Included here, too, were PCs guiding the candidates to areas and sources where information on varieties of materials and approaches could be found. Specific categories within the content area included story-telling, creative writing and spelling. A PC examining proficiency in handwriting (PC 22) was inserted before the resumption of more requests for alternative approaches. PCs 23, 24 and 25 again stressed this category with respect to drama, speech, and listening.

PC 26 sought to lead the candidate to explore the information available on any topic of specific interest to him within the language arts; and PCs 27 and 28 concentrated on assessing knowledge of the process of beginning reading, stressing readiness and decoding. The performance criteria selected for the study were conceived of as those required by generalists in the field of elementary language arts. Not included in the study, but in preparation for eventual operation, were performances expected of specialists in the area. Raters of the students' performances actually pilot-tested some specialist PCs. They were provided with criteria for evaluating each of the performances and were involved in the re-specification of both performances and criteria for the follow-up program.

The study was designed so that each PC would help accomplish at least one level of the hierarchy of skills (Table I); part of the rationale for each PC includes this assumption. The levels covered will not be included within the body of each rationale; the reader is requested to refer to Table I for this information. Table II contains a listing of the PCs used in the feasibility study.

TABLE I

HIERARCHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

(Feasibility Study)

| | Levels of Hierarchy | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PC# | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4a | Level 4b |
| 1 | | X | | X | X |
| 2 | | X | | X | X |
| 3 | | | X | | |
| 4 | | | X | | X |
| 5 | | X | X | | |
| 6 | | X | | X | X |
| 7 | X | | | | |
| 8 | | X | | X | |
| 9 | X | X | | X | |
| 10 | | X | | X | X |
| 11 | | X | X | | |
| 12 | X | | | X | |
| 13 | | | X | X | X |
| 14 | | | | X | |
| 15 | | | X | X | X |
| 16 | | X | X | | |
| 17 | | | X | X | X |
| 18 | X | | | | |
| 19 | | | | X | X |
| 20 | | | | X | X |
| 21 | | | | X | X |
| 22 | X | | | | |
| 23 | | X | | X | X |
| 24 | | X | X | X | X |
| 25 | | X | X | X | X |
| 26 | | | | X | |
| 27 | | X | | | |
| 28 | | X | | X | |

Key:

Level 1 = Proficiency
Level 2 = Knowledge of process
Level 3 = Ability to diagnose
Level 4a = Knowledge of different materials and approaches
Level 4b = Ability to select appropriate approaches and/or materials

TABLE II

Listing of Performance Criteria Used in the Feasibility Study *

| PC | | |
|---|---|---|
| | 1. | Comparing and evaluating three reading texts |
| | 2. | Discussing basals (in small groups) |
| | 3. | Administering an informal reading inventory |
| | 4. | Grouping a class for reading instruction |
| | 5. | Constructing a quiz to test comprehension |
| | 6. | Devising three techniques for analyzing words |
| | 7. | Taking a phonics test |
| | 8. | Reviewing a linguistic reader |
| | 9. | Transcribing and evaluating i/t/a |
| | 10. | Describing five different materials for the language experience approach to teaching reading |
| | 11. | Conducting a survey of interests interview with a child |
| | 12. | Demonstrating the use of three reading machines and/or kits |
| | 13. | Designing one week's activities in language arts for a special population |
| | 14. | Selecting a personal professional library |
| | 15. | Devising three methods of evaluating a reading objective |
| | 16. | Observing and discussing IQ tests |
| | 17. | Selecting a class library |
| | 18. | Reading aloud |
| | 19. | Describing three ways of presenting a story |
| | 20. | Devising three activities for motivating creative writing |
| | 21. | Outlining one formal and one informal method of teaching spelling |
| | 22. | Demonstrating legible writing on a chalkboard |
| | 23. | Devising three dramatic activities |
| | 24. | Describing three ways of achieving a speech objective |
| | 25. | Describing three ways of achieving a listening objective |
| | 26. | Constructing an annotated bibliography on one topic |
| | 27. | Writing a paper on reading readiness |
| | 28. | Writing a paper on the different approaches to beginning reading |

* See appendix for copies of PCs distributed to students for the feasibility study. See Chapter IV for PCs used for follow-up study.

For the first performance, candidates were provided with evaluation forms as suggested guides to their examination of the teachers' manuals for three elementary reading texts. It was required that each text be representative of a different publishing house. The three main areas of investigation entailed appraisal of each publisher's stated purpose, the approach used, and the content. These areas formed the framework within which more specific questions were raised. Candidates were asked both to evaluate and to compare the three texts they had selected. It was also required that the texts be at the same grade level. The publishers included their analysis of the reading process in their statement of approach; the students, therefore became acquainted with the skills deemed necessary. Since the skills and approaches delineated in the manuals differ one from the other and include a wide range of opinions on the intrinsic nature of the reading process (Chall, 1967), it was anticipated that students would begin to appreciate the complexity of the problem and to become aware that no one point of view monopolizes the truth. Additionally, it was hoped that students would discover that as Dechant points out (1964, p. 204), "No materials will fit all pupils in even one classroom", and that the more materials a teacher knows how to use, the more likely it is that the students will benefit. The PC also provided the opportunity for each candidate to explore the materials for the kind of approach with which he felt most comfortable, and to consider different approaches in the light of his own needs for teaching.*

---

* The form for the publisher's comparison is included in the appendix, as are all the forms handed out to the students.

The second PC was designed as an expressive objective (Eisner, 1969). All of the students were required to attend and participate in a discussion of the value of basal readers in American elementary schools. The use of basal readers, as has been mentioned before, is so extensive that students who are preparing to teach must have some understanding of the approach. The question of the effectiveness of basals is one which reading authorities continually debate. Olsen (1967) expressed the opinion of one set of experts that the teachers' guides provided with each basal series offer teachers valuable information and suggestions for teaching a program of skills. On the other hand, Veatch (1966) and Lee and Allen (1963), representing an opposing point of view, urged that teachers avoid a concentrated use of basals or any system which advocates only one set of materials. Because of this controversy it was considered important that the students in the language arts study have the opportunity to discuss the issues involved with each other and with discussion facilitators and also at the same time to share possible suggestions for varying the techniques for basals in the classroom. Although this was designed as an expressive objective, later consideration of this PC brought certain questions to light: if certain outcomes were desirable in this experience, did this make it a measurable rather than expressive objective? Was a discussion on <u>any</u> topic desired here? Or was this an instructional alternative? This PC will be studied further.

For PC three each candidate was required to administer a preconstructed informal reading inventory to one child, and to complete the score sheet for the test. The raters examined the score sheet to see if it had been completed adequately by the candidate. Educators have

recommended the use of this non-standardized tool in order to accumulate information regarding students' strengths and needs and especially to assess their instructional level (Austin and Huebner, 1962). Dolch (1953) offered suggestions to teachers for constructing their own informal reading inventories (IRI) to help determine the level of difficulty a child could manage. The language arts follow-up study changed this PC to require that each candidate compose his own IRI. The one used for the feasibility study was constructed by a graduate class in diagnosis of reading disabilities. The students found that the experience of working with a child on a one-to-one basis was probably as valuable as the testing situation.

Candidates were asked to suggest an effective grouping of a class for reading instruction as their fourth PC. They had access to simulated class record folders (Cruickshank et al, 1967), but they could elect to use any class of their choice as their population to be grouped. The performance tested the candidate's ability to provide an effective organizational structure for reading, given a description of a class, so that the children's needs could be met. Candidates were required to provide a rationale for their goupings. An outline was provided in the packet handed out at the beginning of the semester, which suggested a written format. Unfortunately the outline carried implications that a three-group-system was the preferred arrangement although students were encouraged to use their own judgment. For the follow-up study the outline was discontinued.

PC five called for the learner to select one or more paragraphs from one or more children's texts and to construct a quiz containing

seven questions to test a child's comprehension of the selected passages. The students were given a suggested list of comprehension skills, so that they could refer to this list when constructing the questions. They were prohibited from including questions which could be answered with "yes" or "no". The PC aimed at developing the ability to diagnose and evaluate students' reading power. Melnik (1969) advised teachers to use comprehension questions for both instructional and diagnostic purposes. She cautioned, however, that as many open-ended questions as possible be used so that thought, not "second-guessing the teacher", would be stimulated in the process. This aspect was deemed crucial in the METEP language arts study.

PC six involved the selection of a passage approximately ten sentences in length from which the students selected words to be used in three different lessons involving word analysis. The candidates were provided with a suggested form for a lesson plan and were asked to demonstrate, in their plans, three different techniques for teaching word analysis. It was hoped that through this procedure students would gain a knowledge of the process of the decoding aspect of reading. Ousley and Russell (1966) described six different methods for word analysis and recommended that all of them be employed in the teaching of reading. Durkin (1970) devoted much space to a discussion of the various techniques of word analysis. The students again were reminded in this PC of the variations among individual learners as to what was effective instruction: some children learn most quickly by means of configuration or sight analysis; others rely on a phonic technique. Some need a structural approach; others learn best through a combination of sight word, phonics,

structure, and context. The necessity for a teaching candidate to be familiar with many techniques could not be overlooked.

Only one PC consisted of a short-answer quiz. This was PC seven. An attempt was made throughout the study to deal with more than the first level of Bloom's taxonomy, to vary the evaluative devices, and to permit the students as wide a latitude of individuality as was possible within the context of each performance. Most of the PCs demanded no preconceived "right" answers. However, many studies (Dechant, 1964) have indicated that knowledge of the content of phonics was beneficial for early reading, and Aaron's (1960) findings demons-rated the need for the acquisition of this knowledge during pre-service education. Durkin (1965) devoted many pages of her book to a review of phonics content for the teacher. In the follow-up study the quiz was revised and the PC expanded to include methodology as Heilman (1969) and many others recommended. However, for the purposes of the feasibility study, if the candidate demonstrated proficiency in phonic content, it was judged satisfactory. All of the performances were designed to make the future teacher aware of the never-ending nature of education. No performance was considered to be "terminal" in the sense that the learner could then stop dealing with the subject matter. All of the evaluations were directed at determining whether or not the candidates had achieved "enabling objectives" (Ammerman et al, 1966) which would indicate that they were ready to progress even further in their performance.

PC eight dealt with the linguistic approach, which is a fairly recent approach to the teaching of reading; published materials based on this philosophy were not available in any quantity prior to the past decade.

Lamb (1967) provided an excellent background and explanation of the linquistic approach and pointed out (p. 54) that "the reading programs developed by linguists deserve to be examined objectively, and the appropriate elements of linguistic programs should be put into classroom practice." To satisfy the requirements of the PC, candidates selected a text from a list they were given of those using a linguistic approach and described the linguistic features of this text as distinguished from any other approach.

PC nine was concerned with another recent development in reading approaches. The initial teaching alphabet, or i/t/a, was new to most of the candidates. It, too, was introduced within the past decade. There have been many research studies reported on i/t/a (Kerfoot, 1967); in most of them i/t/a compared very favorably with other approaches. To demonstrate that he had an adequate knowledge of the approach the candidate was required to select one set of sentences (of about twenty words in length) from a given list of five sets and to transcribe these sentences from traditional orthography into i/t/a. He was, in addition, asked to write two paragraphs discussing the issue of whether or not using i/t/a with children who are beginning readers solves many problems in the teaching of reading. Each student was expected to give at least three cogent arguments supporting his position.

Managing a language experience approach to teaching reading was the performance desired for PC ten. Since this procedure is reflected in very few published materials, it was decided to have candidates demonstrate the ability to handle a language - experience program by describing five different materials which might be used in such a program. Students then

had to further describe how these materials might be used with a group of children whom they had selected. Spitzer (1967) compiled a bibliography of more than one hundred references which students could consult; the materials did not have to be originated by the candidate. Lee and Allen (1963) stated that the basic premises of this kind of program are that all of the language arts are interrelated and that reading, in particular, relates strongly to the others; that while words by themselves have no inherent meaning, the reader responds to words based on his own individual experiences. The authors included a reference list supporting the idea of an instructional program which brings together reading, listening, speaking, and writing within the framework of a child's experiential background.

PC eleven demanded that the candidate demonstrate the ability to conduct only one of a great many tasks necessary for an individualized reading program. Darrow and Howes (1960) discussed many facets of the program, but agreed that the identifying components are the different organizational structures possible because of the principles upon which the program is based. The possible groupings within the structure are those such as: the child working and reading alone, the child and the teacher in conference, the child and another child working together or on a tutorial basis, small groups designated by the teacher to work on a particular skill, small groups, self-generated because of a task or interest base, large groups led by the teacher, large groups led by a child, whole class led by the teacher or assembled to hear a presentation by one or more children. All of these arrangements are an integral part of the program on an ongoing basis. Veatch (1966) recommended including most of

the above in each reading period. She also summarized the principles of individualized reading instruction as including: self-selection, that is, each child should be permitted to select from many reading materials the one with which he wishes to work; planning by students and teacher together so that the children participate actively in their own instruction; self-pacing, that is, there is no pre-set order, rank, or a pace for any given child, nor is there a clearly extablished sequence of skills for all children, self-evaluation as a continuous activity, sharing of one's interests on a voluntary basis. Veatch (p.4) pointed out that this kind of reading instruction depends upon "A variety of materials with literary merit, the use of children's own speech, in various ways, at all age levels, the incentive factor of pupil-selected material, the teacher-pupil conference on a one-to-one basis." As Smith (1967) added, this kind of program cannot fail to be beneficial to children. Although it requires more of a teacher than simply following instructions from a manual, Duker (1968) warned that it is an error to regard this program as impractical or unrealistic. He felt that (p. 10) "The essence of I. R. is that this approach is a plan for taking into account all the kinds of differences that exist among pupils." When the METEP language arts program is in full operation, many more PCs will undoubtedly be available for those students who wish to become proficient in using the individualized reading approach. The PC was expanded for the follow-up study, but for the feasibility study the only act required of the students was that they conduct interviews with children for the purpose of ascertaining their reading interests and their degree of motivation for reading. This interview was a model for the first conference a teacher should

engage in for individualized reading. A form suggested for use in this interview was included in the students' packets.

PC twelve dealt with materials for use in a reading program, but only in terms of aiding reinforcement of specific skills. Candidates were required to select three reading kits, machines or other devices from the materials available in the reading studies office and demonstrate their use. A list of the available materials was included in the students' packet. Some of these materials were designed to help learners increase their reading speed; some were tachistoscopic in nature and were therefore helpful for correcting or guiding eye movements. It was hoped that future teachers who might one day enter classrooms equipped with these devices would become comfortable enough with the procedures so that they would be able to use any new technological materials that would be of benefit to their students. Shane and Mulry (1963) reported a dramatic increase in both the use of and the interest in educational media on the part of teachers.

The only PC that dealt specifically with the situation of urban or gifted or retarded children was PC thirteen. This PC did not attempt to test specialist competence in this area, only a generalist introductory capability of planning for a special population. Rather than deal with any or every category which might be labeled "special" candidates were asked either to select a description of a special population from many such descriptions filed on the METEP reserve shelf in the library or to provide their own description of a class containing a special population. They then had to design a set of instructional activities for language arts for a period of one week. The activities were expected to be paced

and planned with the particular needs of the specific children in mind. In both Durr's (1967) and Frost's (1967) books of readings, as well as in others, all of the experts writing about teaching reading to special populations agreed that organization, methods, and materials need to be tailored to the needs of the individual student. This PC sought to acquaint the student with the problems as well as solutions inherent in this educational setting.

For PC fourteen candidates were to imagine that they possessed one hundred dollars which they could spend on their own personal professional library. If the students demonstrated that they had used a variety of sources in selecting their library and had listed periodicals as well as books, it was considered that they had met the objective of becoming familiar with the professional literature in the field of language arts.

PC fifteen aimed at the diagnostic and evaluative capabilities of the participants in the study. Students were given a list of reading objectives and a class description form. After the candidate had described a class, he was to select an appropriate reading objective and tell, in detail, three ways of evaluating that objective. Lee and Allen (1963) outlined the important steps of evaluation and stressed that evaluation and grading are not the same. They reminded the teacher that evaluation does not necessarily mean that a judgment has been made but implies a continuous process of analysis and progression. They further recommended that children should share in the process. It was hoped that the candidates would select diverse activities so that they would realize the necessity of using multiple means of evaluation, rather than relying on one or few. Webb et al. (1966) made this point when they suggested the

use of unobtrusive measures to supplement and cross-validate other means. The PC was also designed so that students would consider the formulation of objectives and would have to narrow and specify one objective from the list of broad goals which they were given. In addition to Mager (1962), Possien (1969) offered advice to teachers on how to formulate and evaluate objectives. This performance will be considerably expanded when the program is in complete operation. It is planned that eventually candidates will be required to evaluate many of their own performances.

PC sixteen was another expressive objective. The whole area of evaluative devices and how to use them was thought to be of such importance that candidates were required to attend a taped demonstration of an individually administered IQ test and to participate in a discussion of IQ tests, their validity and usefulness. A non-standardized instrument, the Dove Counter-balance intelligence test was administered at the same session to provide the candidates with more food for discussion.

For PC seventeen the participant described a class, using the form supplied in the packet, and selected twenty-five books for use as a library in this class. The student also provided a rationale for each book he selected. This PC aimed at testing a knowledge of children's needs and interests in mind. Arbuthnot (1957) provided many suggestions and information on book selection and on the wide varieties of children's books available at this time. Shane and Mulry (1963) reported many studies concerning children's literary preferences and the importance of introducing literature into the classroom.

PC eighteen continued the investigation of children's literature, but also tested the candidates' oral presentation skills. Students had to

select a passage from a children's book and read it aloud to one of the raters. The raters observed such factors as voice projection, variation, tone, eye contact, fluency, and the ability to project the meaning of the passage. Although different kinds of teaching techniques were encouraged throughout the study, it was recognized that teachers still rely heavily on oral presentations in the classroom. They therefore needed to demonstrate these abilities during their pre-service education.

For PC nineteen presentation skills and children's literature were again combined and the notion of variety was added: candidates were required to select a story and plan three lessons, each presenting the story in a different manner. Not only were the different methods of presenting the story evaluated, but also their suitability to the story was weighed. One of the factors in devising this PC was the understanding that motivation is of tremendous importance in the reading process. When stories are presented in different and interesting fashions, children become interested in reading these stories.

PC twenty required the candidates to describe, in detail, three different approaches for motivating creative writing. They were to design these approaches for a specific class they had described on the form provided for them. The students were informed that they would be rated on the diversity and appropriateness of the activities. The PC tested the ability of the candidates to match learning activities with needs and abilities of their pupils while at the same time valuing their pupils' creativity. It was not required that the activities be original with the candidate, but it was expected that the pupils would be provided with options which would free their creativity. Applegate (1954) and West

(1967) reported many studies examining the process through which teachers could motivate their students' creative writing. Their attitude was found to be of great importance. Shane and Mulry (1963) noted numerous categories which dealt with suggestions for encouraging creativity in written expression.

PC twenty-one led candidates to differentiate between formal and informal procedures for teaching spelling and to generate activities for both. They were given a list of fifty words from which they were to select twenty. They then had to describe one formal and one informal set of tasks for teaching these words. Shane and Mulry (1963) found the greatest number of writings concerned with the improvement of spelling instruction through better teaching methods. Books of readings in the language arts such as Petty's (1968) and Leonard's (Leonard et al, 1965) also stress diversity, motivation and methodology.

PC twenty-two tested only the proficiency level of handwriting. In the follow-up this was expanded, but for the feasibility study candidates wrote two sentences on the chalkboard, one in manuscript and one in cursive style. They were rated on legibility and consistency of form.

PC twenty-three represented a return to the task of devising alternative activities. As in PC twenty-one both formal and informal instruction was examined. Students again provided a description of a class for whom the instruction was designed. They then had to submit plans for dramatic activities for use with this class at least two of which were required to be informal. Ward (1960) expressed the opinion that formal drama was very valuable and conducive to unifying the subject matter of several content areas. Spolin (1966) enumerated a number of questions to guide

decisions on choosing plays. She also specified guidelines for procedures for both formal and informal presentations. The PC was designed to test the candidate's ability to utilize drama in the classroom. It was assumed that participants in the program were more familiar with the formal aspects of drama than with the comparatively new area of improvisation and informal drama. Therefore the PC demanded the investigation of this aspect.

PC twenty-four dealt with the aspect of teaching oral communication in the classroom. Students received a list of speech objectives adapted from the New York City Board of Education's Toward Better Speech (1953). The objectives were categorized into attitude, voice, phrasing, tempo, and practical application. Candidates were to describe a class, choose one objective from the list supplied, and suggest three alternative methods for achieving the objective. Candidates were rated on the variety and appropriateness of the activities. Speech was considered a very important area within the language arts. Kerfoot (1967) reported studies verifying the positive correlation between speech competence and reading. Shane and Mulry (1963) included reports of eighty-five studies in speech, ranging from research on language development to suggestions for classroom teachers.

PC twenty-five arranged for the same kinds of behaviors in the area of listening that PC twenty-four had for speech. This time a list of listening objectives was supplied, and three activities were requested after the student had selected one objective. Sheldon and Lashinger (1969) cited summaries of investigations into the correlation between listening and reading. Duker (1964) included many annotated references on the effectiveness of oral as well as written presentations and research in

the field. Shane and Mulry (1963) again reviewed many aspects including goals and general suggestions to teachers. The objective of the PC was to test whether or not participants in the study could identify the listening needs of pupils and provide appropriate means of fulfilling those needs.

PC twenty-six was similar to PC fourteen in that candidates were required to compile a list of professional source materials. In fact these two PCs were combined for the follow-up. But for the feasibility study students compiled a twenty-five item annotated bibliography in any area of language arts. Annotations were restricted to two sentences per item. Diversity of source material and applicability to the selected area were rated. It was anticipated that the students would avail themselves of the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the Education Index, ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center) microfiche materials, teachers' guides, curriculum guides, periodicals, and texts, as well as films, records, and other media.

Most of the PCs permitted the students to select children at any grade level. Theoretically this was possible with PC twenty-seven too, but practically, this PC was more concerned with the young child than with the older one. It required a discussion of the statement: "Readiness for reading involves a combination of factors which a teacher of reading must consider." Candidates were rated on the comprehensiveness and specificity of the factors that they mentioned. The candidates were asked to consider the complexity of the process of reading readiness and the controversy between the effects of nature as opposed to nurture on readiness for reading. Kerfoot (1967) reported a concentration on research into ways

of making children ready to read. A check list for reading readiness (Anderson, 1967, pp 206-208) was available to the students for their use. For the expanded program it is planned that students will be asked to investigate and compare the different theories of the various schools of thought concerning this vital area.

PC twenty-eight echoed some of the objectives of PCs one and six. For the follow-up, therefore, it was incorporated into the other PCs. During the feasibility study students were asked to write a paper discussing the statement, "Beginning reading instruction must include procedures for acquiring word analysis skills and procedures for memorizing whole words." The students' familiarity with several approaches was tested here.

It was planned that more PCs would be constructed for each component of the language arts so that every level of the hierarchy would be tested for each sub-area. It was also decided that when the program is expanded, students will be permitted to choose not only instructional alternatives but also performance criteria.

## Instructional Alternatives

Students were permitted to select whatever means of instruction they thought would prove valuable to them in learning to accomplish any of the required performances. For the feasibility study at least two instructional alternatives (IAs) were constructed specifically for each PC. A lecture was scheduled and presented for each PC as one alternative when it became clear through direct feedback that students desired it. Students were also given the option of attempting any PC without first receiving any

instruction. Some students did take advantage of this option (Wilson, 1970); a few used it as a pre-testing experience to give themselves a clear idea of what a PC entailed; others were successful in passing the PC on their first attempt. Wilson also found that several factors influenced the candidates' decisions as to which IAs, if any, they would try. Students varied considerably in their level of previous experience with children and with the specific subject matter. They also varied in their risk-taking abilities and in their willingness to use technological devices, such as TV recorders. Each candidate was encouraged to devise a new instructional alternative if he so desired, or if none of the available IAs suited his needs. In the follow-up more categories of IAs were enumerated than in the feasibility study, but Wilson found, even in the feasibility study, that students utilized combinations of those offered, and added more. IAs even more than PCs were constantly revised and expanded. For the feasibility study the most consistently offered IA was the class lecture. Also offered were taped television presentations, folders of selected relevant readings in the library, the general resources of the education library, the opportunity to observe and work with designated groups of children in the Mark's Meadow elementary school (this is the laboratory school of the University of Massachusetts), a programmed text (for PC seven, - teaching phonics content), filmstrips and records (explaining the 1/t/a program), films, and discussions.

## Suggestions

The expanded program will be described in chapter four. It was developed directly from the comments of raters and students in the

feasibility study, as well as from whatever additional expert opinion became available. More specific information on students' responses to each PC is included in Wilson's (1970) study.

On the whole, PC one accomplished its purpose. It was suggested, however, that the inclusion of a comparison of all three texts be more firmly requested. PC two was well received by the participants. More opportunities for discussion were desired. Students enjoyed PC three because it provided them with the opportunity to work directly with children. It was decided to revise this PC, however, to specify that the students construct their own informal reading inventory so as to equip them with this ability. PC four as it was designed did not communicate clearly enough to all of the students that they had the option of grouping as they saw fit. Too many of them thought they were being forced into a permanent, three-group approach. Students also wished that they had had real, rather than simulated, children with whom to work. Students were confused by PC five's requirement of selecting a specific passage. They were also ignorant of the meaning of some of the listed skills and of suitable techniques for questioning. Participants recommended that PC six be reworded for clarity. They asked that PC seven test more than proficiency although they recognized the importance of phonics in a reading program. Most candidates valued PCs eight and nine, probably because both introduced new approaches. It was suggested that PC ten be reworded so that students understand more clearly what is expected of them. To the extent that PC ten was meant to give candidates an insight, introduction, or overview of the individualized reading approach it was not

successful. The candidates, however, enjoyed conducting the interview and felt that they had learned much from it about children and their interests, but either an additional PC or an addition to this PC would be necessary for our students to learn how to manage such a program. Because proficiency was the level stressed in PC twelve, that is, the ability to operate the devices, students lost sight of the purpose for which these materials were designed. They also requested learning the application of the devices in the classroom. Students were generally satisfied with PC thirteen. Raters felt that the ability to provide continuity in the week's activities needed improvement, and suggested a rewording of the task. PC fourteen's wording confused the students. They did not generally take enough time to examine the items they listed. Raters again suggested that PC fifteen be designed so that students would be required to rewrite the general objective in behavioral terms. PC sixteen appeared to be effective and worthwhile, as was PC seventeen. Students felt an enormous value inherent in reading and considering many children's books. Students and raters alike enjoyed and benefited from PC eighteen, but candidates believed that PC nineteen could be equally as valuable if descriptions rather than lesson plans were called for. PC twenty needed to be reworded to emphasize the eventual freeing of the pupil's creativity rather than the cleverness of the teacher's motivating device. It was found for PC twenty-one that asking a student to use an informal approach with a prepared word list was logically inconsistant and confusing to the students, since informal spelling implies the generation of the words by the children during practical use. Participants recommended that the

lists be eliminated.

Candidates almost unanimously agreed that PC twenty-two was valuable. PC twenty-three was also popular because students became aware of the different ways they might incorporate drama into the curriculum. It was suggested that rewording PC twenty-four might encourage a more child-centered approach than was elicited by the original PC; many students focused on the creativity of their approaches, rather than their applicability to the objective and to the target population; the same comments held true for PC twenty-five. PC twenty-six somehow confused proficiency in the ability to compile book lists with knowledge of a variety of materials. Unfortunately, most students regarded this PC as a chore and pointed out that they had had to compile numerous such lists during the course of their academic experiences in the University. Most students felt that PC twenty-seven was beneficial, but a few objected to it on the grounds that it required nothing more than a regurgitation of the information found in the readings. They therefore recommended that additional PCs, or this one, revised, include some practical application of the knowledge they had acquired. Finally, it was suggested that PC twenty-eight be incorporated with others, and that a PC dealing with grammar be added.

The candidates participated actively and enthusiastically in the study. They reported in general that they felt very well prepared to enter the classroom. They expressed pleasure at having learned about the content, the many approaches to the teaching of reading and to the other aspects of the language arts. They supplied valuable information in their questionnaires and in numerous interviews concerning the study, all of

which was employed as input for the process of revising the curriculum for the next semester. *

* For a description of the management of the program, see Wilson (1970).

# CHAPTER IV

## THE FOLLOW-UP STUDY: CURRICULUM

The feasibility study was conducted with one hundred eleven students and seventeen raters. All of the "methods of language arts" students were involved in the study. Raters were almost all graduate students who wished to specialize in the language arts. They undertook the rating of the PCs as independent studies. During the spring semester, 1970, the follow-up study included only thirty students. These undergraduates constituted only one section of the methods course. There were forty raters, nine of whom were students who had taken part in the METEP feasibility study the semester before, and who wished to further expand their knowledge in the field of language arts. The raters enrolled in a course called, "Workshop in Language Arts", which was designed as the management component for the undergraduate performance-based curriculum. Raters were required not only to rate PCs but to advise students, to give information and help on PCs, to devise IAs and to aid in expanding and revising the curriculum. They met in a large group once a week and served as advisors in the language arts office once a week. It was hoped by providing this kind of continuous service to the student that he would receive advice, comfort, and a sense of personal identification in the program. Raters performed specialist criteria by their participation in the program.

In addition to expanding the specialist section of the study, the instructional alternatives, too, were greatly expanded. Eleven categories of IAs were assembled for almost every PC. The categories were

1. Lecture (live): Class lectures were scheduled in advance. They included time for questions and discussion.

2. Lecture (on tape): Lectures for each PC were available on audiotape. They could be listened to in Room 2 at any time. Room 2 was the language arts center in the School of Education. A rater was on hand to answer questions.
3. Library folder of readings: folders were prepared and constantly revised and expanded. They contained articles, excerpts from books, and/or samples of helpful materials.
4. Library browsing: suggested reading lists were compiled for those students who wanted to select and read on their own. They were free as well, to browse and select their own readings independent of any suggestions.
5. Informal discussion with the staff: raters were available on a scheduled basis to give advice and information.
6. Informal discussion with others: roommates, classroom teachers, former students, other students, and children were among the people who were suggested as possibly being very helpful to students in terms of learning how to successfully accomplish a PC.
7. Audio-visual materials: interesting and useful TV tapes, records and film strips, slides, and other studio visual presentations were assembled for most of the PC's. These materials were located in Room 2 and could be checked out and used in the Media Lab, located in Room 22 of the School of Education. Someone was available to help the students use the equipment daily from 9 A.M. to 2:30 P.M. Individual arrangements could be made through the Media

Center, Room 130, for use after 2:30 P.M.

8. Observation: Students were advised to observe the class in which they would be student teaching. This experience could provide them with a frame of reference for the PCs as well as for student teaching. If, however, it was not possible to visit and observe in their prospective student teaching class, they were invited to the Mark's Meadow observation corridor. The observation corridor provides a view through one-way glass of all of the classrooms in the school. The classes can be heard as well as seen.
9. Practice: For those PCs where "practice" was a convenient IA, students could make arrangements in advance to practice in a classroom. Again, their student teaching class was advisable.
10. Pretest: If students believed that they could successfully accomplish a PC without using any instructional alternative, or if they thought that attempting the PC would, of itself, constitute a good IA, they could do so, and submit the PC for rating.
11. Other: Students were encouraged to think of any other IA that might help them to accomplish the PC. They were further invited to share their ideas with the staff.

The PCs themselves were revised and listed for the students. The following is the revised list distributed to the students in the follow-up study incorporating the suggestions which were made by students and raters during the feasibility study.

P.C. 1. Given the Elementary Reading text book section of the Education Library:

a. select three readers with their accompanying teacher's manuals. Each reader must represent a different publisher but all should be at the same grade level. At least two of the following approaches must be represented.

basal eclectic
linguistic
phonic
i/t/a
programmed

b. evaluate each book and compare it with others, using the following guidelines for each book: (See appendix and note that this is a revised version of the one used in the feasibility study).

P.C. 2. Given the opportunity to gather some background information about theories of beginning reading, participate in a discussion of these theories and their practice in today's schools. Discussion schedules will be posted. Select any of the instructional alternatives to provide yourself with the necessary background information before attending the discussion. Successful completion of P.C. 1 could constitute an I.A. for P.C. 2.

P.C. 3. Given the statement, "Readiness for reading involves a combination of factors which a teacher of reading must consider", given the opportunity to observe a child in kindergarten or first grade, and given the following check list for reading readiness (see appendix):

a. write a short essay of not more than one typewritten page developing the given statement.

b. observe and describe a child, using the check list as a guideline.

c. using the check list as your frame of reference, devise one activity in each area of readiness: physical, social, emotional and mental to help meet the child's readiness needs. Submit the completed check list with the activities.

P.C. 4. Given the opportunity to observe a class of approximately twenty children: (if possible select children from the class in which you will student teach).

a. assemble information you deem pertinent about fifteen of the children.

b. recommend a grouping arrangement for reading for these fifteen children.

c. specify whether this arrangement is for one lesson, one week, one month, one semester, etc.

d. state a rationale for each group, as well as for the overall arrangement.

P.C. 5. Given the opportunity to collect an assortment of books at different graded levels of difficulty, and given the opportunity to select a child:

a. select a child (preferably from the class in which you will student teach).

b. construct an informal reading inventory (preferably using the texts available in the child's classroom).

c. administer the informal reading inventory.

d. fill out and submit one of the following score sheets for each of

the books you use. (See appendix)

P.C. 6. Given the following list of comprehension skills:

finding the main idea

seeing sequence of ideas

recalling details

drawing conclusions

making inferences

predicting outcomes

differentiating between fact and opinion

seeing relationships

ascertaining the author's intent

describing the tone of a selection

describing the mood of a selection

classifying vocabulary

analyzing character

skimming to find a specific fact

reading to follow directions

reading critically to detect false reasoning

a. select one or more passages from children's books, magazines, newspaper articles, poems, etc.

b. devise ten questions, testing at least five of the skills of comprehension.

c. indicate which skill each question tests.

d. include possible acceptable answers to each question.

e. devise only questions which require other than a "yes" or "no" answer.

P.C. 7. Given the following passages from children's books, each with specific words underlined:

"...Trufflehunter called at the mouth of a little hole in a green bank and out popped the last thing Caspian expected--a Talking Mouse. He was of course bigger than a common mouse, well over a foot high when he stood on his hind legs, and with ears nearly as long as (though broader than) a rabbit's. His name was Reenicheen and he was a gay and martial mouse. He wore a tiny little rapier at his side and twirled his long whiskers as if they were a moustache."

(Lewis, 1951, p. 65)

"Under the ground in tunnels black,
The trains go forward and then come back,
Stop at stations lighted bright,
And take you safely home at night.

Under the streets, the stores, the shops,
The subway train makes many stops.
It's fun to ride the subway train
It takes you there and back again.

(Bissett, 1968, p. 52)

"I hear," Casey said. "I don't know what all the fuss is about. Heavens, you'd think I was a gragon! Oh well, I'm not worried. When they realize how famous I'm becoming, it will be a different story, you wait and see."

(Feagles, 1964, p. 80)

"It will take time to come back," said Tom.
"That is right, Tom," said Mr. Logan.
"You will go with Mr. Adams to get the cattle," Mr. Logan said to Tom.
"Dan and I will be here.
"We will look after the ranches." (Chandler, 1966, pp. 10, 11)

"Meanwhile the dragon, a happy Bohemian, lolled on the turf, enjoyed the sunsets, told antediluvian anecdotes to the Boy, and polished his old verses while meditating on fresh ones."

(Grahame, 1964, p. 18)

"The dragon was employing the interval in giving a ramping-performance for the benefit of the crowd. Ramping, it should be explained, consists in running round and round in a wide circle, and sending waves in ripples of movement along the whole length of your spine, from your pointed ears right down to the spike at the end of your long tail."

(Grahame, 1964, p. 44)

a. describe a group of five children (preferably from the class in which you will student teach) in terms of their needs in word analysis, and their general level of development and achievement.

b. select one appropriate passage from the above, or construct or select one from any source of your choice.

c. select at least two words which you can use as the basis for a word analysis lesson.

d. describe three approaches, techniques, or devices for teaching analysis of the words you have selected to the group you have described.

P.C. 8. Given the statement by Jeanne Chall "that a code-emphasis method... produces better results" (1967, p. 307) in terms of beginning reading, and given the fact that perhaps the most often considered approach to decoding is the phonics approach, and given a phonics test:

a. pass the phonics test with a score of 70% or above.

b. write a paper (or prepare an oral presentation) in which you either defend the phonics approach as the only appropriate approach or present arguments showing that other methods may be as appropriate, OR a paper detailing why you disagree with Jeanne Chall's statement.

P.C. 9. Given the following three passages:

I came to ask for something, my wife is very unhappy. You see, we live in a very small house. If you could get me a big house, this would make my wife happy.

Ricky jumped up and put both hands in the pockets of his blue

jeans and started toward the barn. Spot woke up, stretched one leg, then the other, and started after him.

In a pond in the woods lived a turtle. One of the things the turtle liked to do was to sit on a rock in the sun. He liked to look at the pretty trees too. He also liked to look at the birds flying in the sky.

and given the following statement:

"i/t/a solves many problems in the teaching of reading."

a. select one of the given passages and transcribe it into i/t/a.

b. compose two typewritten paragraphs commenting on the quoted statement. (You may agree, disagree, or remain neutral.)

P.C. 10 Given sets of Linguistic readers, such as Harper and Row, Merrill, S.R.A., Bloomfield-Barnhart, Sullivan and Miami, and using categories such as philosophy, vocabulary, use of pictures, content, or others:

a. select at least two texts to examine.

b. distinguish and describe the features of a reader which uses the "linguistic approach."

P.C. 11. Given the statement: "Reading is concerned with words that arouse meaningful responses based on the individual experiences of the learner" (Lee and Allen, 1963, p. 2)

a. describe a group of five children (preferably from the class in which you will student teach) in terms of each child's personality, interests, reading level, and reading needs.

b. describe three activities for these children to engage in, as part of the experience approach to teaching reading. Be very specific in your descriptions of the activities. Each activity

must represent a different category of experience.

c. provide an explanation of how each of the activities you recommend relates to reading.

P.C. 12. Given the statement, "Individualized reading is not recreational reading, is not a tutorial approach and is not unstructured, but rather is a carefully planned approach for teaching the skills of reading based on the principles of self-evaluation":

a. explain the three principles.

b. describe a plan for a one hour session of reading with approximately thirty children, using the Individualized Reading Approach.

P.C. 13. Given a collection of packaged publishers' kits (such as S.R.A. and Random House) and machines used for reading (such as tachistoscopes and controlled readers):

a. demonstrate the use of three of the available machines and/or kits.

b. describe a situation or context within which each of the three selected kits or devices could be used.

P.C. 14. Given descriptions of classes, each containing a "special student population (such as a gifted, retarded, physically handicapped, emotionally disturbed, urban, rural):

a. select one of the given descriptions or one of you own.

b. supply one typewritten paragraph summarizing the description of the class you have selected.

c. design five consecutive lessons in reading or any of the language arts especially suitable for this class. The lessons must bear a relationship, one to the other, and be appropriate in pacing and sequence as well as content.

P.C. 15. Given a tour of the Education Library, and the opportunity to browse and read:

a. select ten journals (not specific articles), professional texts, and other materials available in the library dealing with the language arts.

b. write (or report orally) what each of the ten selected materials has to offer of specific interest to you. (Diversity of sources, and the ability to establish relevance will be rated).

P.C. 16. Given the form for describing a class, and given the following list of reading objectives (see appendix):

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. select one of the above reading objectives, and narrow it to a specific objective pertinent to the needs of this class, a group in this class, or a particular individual in this class.

c. describe three alternative methods of evaluating the attainment of the objective.

P.C. 17. Given the date March 17, at 1:30 P.M. in Room 226, for a demonstration of IQ testing:

a. attend the demonstration

b. complete and discuss the Dove IQ test. This is an expressive objective, and has no IA's.

P.C. 18. Given the appended form for a class description and given the opportunity to visit a children's library:

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. select twenty-five books appropriate for this class' library.

c. provide a brief rationale for the choice of each book.

P.C. 19. Given the opportunity to visit a childre-'s library, and given the appended form for a class description:

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. select a story appropriate for the class or group in the class.

c. describe three different, appropriate (in terms of the children, and of the story) ways of presenting the story to the children. You may use any media, materials, or techniques of your choice. Use techniques in addition to or other than simply telling or reading the story.

P.C. 20. Given the opportunity to visit a children's library:

a. select a passage from a book that seems interesting for children, and which you believe to be suitable for reading aloud.

b. prepare to read the selected passage aloud.

c. sign up on the schedule sheet posted outside Room 2 for an appointment to read your selected passage aloud. You will be rated on your eye contact, variation of facial and vocal

expression, and your fluency in reading the selection.

P.C. 21. Given a form for describing a class, and given the following paragraph defining creative writing:

> Writing starts from ideas - and children are full of ideas. Creative ideas are those we believe in so strongly that they pound the inner door to be released. It does not matter whether a teacher assigned the writing or we assigned it to outselves: if we feel it, we can be taught to write it. Writing without feeling is anemic and bloodless, and the writer has no pride in it. Creative writing, then, is writing that pushes itself out of a bed of ideas. (Applegate, 1954, p. 1)

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. describe in detail three activities aimed at motivating this class, or a group in this class to write creatively. The activities must specifically be aimed at freeing the child's creativity. Do not substitute clever teacher - made devices for this criterion.

P.C. 22. Given the form for describing a class and the following spelling goals:

> To help each child learn to spell correctly the words he has occasion to use in his writing.
>
> To create an interest in correct spelling; that is, to promote a feeling of pride in the ability to spell correctly the words used in individual writing.
>
> To help each child to form correct study habits so that he can attack spelling problems independently.

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. outline one week's appropriate activities in spelling for this class, or for a group in this class. When

applicable, include the words you will teach.

P.C. 23. Given the form for describing a class, and the following list of listening objectives (see Appendix).

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. select a listening objective appropriate for the class or a group within the class.

c. describe two approaches or activities for achieving the objective.

P.C. 24. Given the appended form for describing a class, and given the following list of speech objectives adapted from the New York City Board of Education Curriculum Guide, Toward Better Speech: (see Appendix).

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. select an objective from the list, or devise one of your own, appropriate for this class or a group within it.

c. describe three alternative approaches for achieving the selected objective.

P.C. 25. Given the form for describing a class, and the statement, "Informal and formal dramatics may be used effectively in the schools as a vehicle for presenting material in all curriculum areas."

a. describe a class of approximately twenty children.

b. design two dramatic activities, at least one of which is informal, illustrating the given statement.

P.C. 26. Given the following paragraph describing the Linguistic approach to teaching grammar (Roberts, 1966, pp T7, T9):

> Generative transform grammar contains both a syntactic component and a phonological component. The syntactic component contains such matters as words and parts of words and their arrangement in sentences. It contains what is conventionally thought of as the content of grammar - nouns and verbs, subjects and objects, number and tense, prepositional phrases and relative clauses. The phonological component describes the sound structure of the language; it is composed of the rules for pronouncing English... It may be said that the grammar of English (or of any language) is now thought to be best viewed as a small set of sentences, called kernel sentences, plus a set of rules for transforming these into more complicated structures. Given a finite set of kernel sentence structures plus a finite set of transformational rules, we can generate infinitely many sentences, including infinitely many never produced before. The working out of the precise nature of the kernel structure and the precise nature of the transformation rules is the task of the grammarian.
>
> a. compare this approach with a traditional approach in terms of its implications for elementary classrooms. (in two type-written pages or less)
>
> b. suggest two activities, other than using a grammar textbook in which grammatical principles can be communicated to children.

P.C. 27. Given a chalkboard and chalk, demonstrate a lesson (of no more than five minutes' duration) teaching one aspect of handwriting, in either manuscript or cursive forms. (You may schedule yourself for this on the sign-up sheet outside Room 2).

Wilson (1970) evaluated this program. Again the students responded with enthusiasm about the amount of material they felt they had learned. The specialists were particularly pleased with the depth of information they had gained, and with the varieties of performances in which they had engaged. It should be noted that criteria for rating the PCs were distributed to both raters and students in the follow-up program; in the feasibility study only raters received copies. These and all other

materials handed out to the students appear in the appendix. It is hoped that progress will continue to be made in revising and expanding the IAs. The next important step will be to expand the number of PCs and to permit the students to choose from those offered. See Table III for the hierarchical distribution of PCs in the follow-up study.

TABLE III

HIERARCHICAL DISTRIBUTION OF THE PERFORMANCE CRITERIA

Follow-up Study

| | Levels of Hierarchy | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| PC # | Level 1 | Level 2 | Level 3 | Level 4a | Level 4b |
| 1 | | X | | X | X |
| 2 | | X | | X | X |
| 3 | | X | X | X | X |
| 4 | | X | X | X | X |
| 5 | | X | X | | |
| 6 | | X | X | | |
| 7 | | X | X | X | X |
| 8 | X | X | | X | |
| 9 | X | X | | X | |
| 10 | | X | | X | |
| 11 | | X | X | X | X |
| 12 | | X | X | X | X |
| 13 | X | X | | X | X |
| 14 | | X | X | X | X |
| 15 | | X | | X | |
| 16 | X | X | X | X | X |
| 17 | | X | X | | |
| 18 | | X | X | X | X |
| 19 | X | X | X | X | X |
| 20 | X | | | | |
| 21 | | X | X | X | X |
| 22 | | X | X | X | X |
| 23 | | X | X | X | X |
| 24 | | X | X | X | X |
| 25 | | X | X | X | X |
| 26 | | X | | X | X |
| 27 | X | X | | | |

Key:

Level 1 = Proficiency
Level 2 = Knowledge of Process
Level 3 = Ability to Diagnose
Level 4a = Knowledge of different materials and approaches
Level 4b = Ability to select appropriate approach

# CHAPTER V

## COMMENTS

The language arts studies, feasibility and follow-up, were models for future language arts programs at the School of Education. Much was learned from these studies, and it is hoped that the learning process will continue. In fact, one of the most successful aspects of the program was its adaptability to the needs of the students and its acceptance of students' ideas for change, which were implemented willingly and immediately. The direction which the program will take in the future is seen to be toward offering the participants some choice as to which performances they will master. This necessitates the construction of many more tasks in each area so that students may select vertically and horizontally if they so desire. The PCs will eventually be available on a one-at-a-time basis for any student (including a freshman) to attempt at any time, with a specified number required for graduation.

Although more specific information can be found in Wilson's (1970) study, consensus (as determined by interview and written report) was that the feasibility and follow-up studies accomplished the goals. Students consistently reported their attempts to use many approaches during their student teaching experiences. Some students expressed frustration at not being able to try some of the ideas they had learned during the study, but stated their determination to remedy the situation during their teaching careers. Admittedly, a few students found it difficult at first to understand why if one approach "worked," another should be tried, but having the knowledge of multiple means of instruction was accepted as valuable by all participants. All of the students became

aware of, and many tried to expand their learning styles. Most participants thought that the performance based curriculum was a noticeable improvement over the traditional methods course, and that they had learned more in this kind of "course" than would have been possible the other way. Many candidates, however, confessed that this kind of system required much more work on their part than any other.

The instructional alternatives were not tested as extensively as was hoped. Most students attended lectures or used the library folders, or combined the two methods. Some candidates listened to the audio tapes; very few used the television tapes or any other audio-visual media. Most of the participants talked to raters or others, but many who did this did not list it as an IA., probably because they were unused to considering this kind of activity as a legitimate instructional device. Perhaps a series of scheduled television demonstrations would encourage more students to avail themselves of the media alternative. If the problem was lack of experience with the medium or reluctance to handle equipment, the idea of the scheduled demonstrations might alleviate the situation.

The program succeeded in providing an overview of the elementary language arts curriculum. It remains to be seen whether or not it succeeded as a model for future behavior.

The systems approach of input, process, output and feedback which was utilized in the studies encouraged questions for future research. All of participants, students, raters, designers and evaluators, were involved in a continuous process of examination and discussion of the program. Other investigators have suggested areas for research such as the effect

of what the student has learned on his future behavior, the conditions of learning, and their generalizability, media and its use in teacher education, and specific language arts content. All of the findings in above research endeavors would be of use in continuing the revision of the METEP language arts model.

## Suggestions for Future Research

Glaser and Reynolds (1964) observed that studies should be conducted concerning the (p. 49) "long-term relationships between the kind of thing the student is taught and the way he is eventually required to behave in our society or in his job..." Future investigations should therefore include evaluation of the student-teaching and professional behavior of participants in the performance-based curriculum. Do teachers educated in this fashion provide more options for their pupils? The question of how change occurs in the schools could also be included in this kind of research. With former students as the subjects under consideration, variables such as varieties of activities offered in the classrooms, openness to pupils' differences, provision for individualization and competence in the subject matter should be studied.

Other areas for future research have been suggested before in this work. Certainly one very fertile topic is that of aptitude treatment interaction. Cronbach (1967) suggested that we need data on learning rates under instructional conditions. Briggs (1968) conjectured that research into the unique patterns distinguishing one student's learning style from another's would yield data accounting for most of the variance between one learner's achievement and another. Briggs recommended more

inquiry into the possibilities of adapting media to learner-differences. Pressey (1963) suggested attempts to insure better use and formulation of auto-instructional devices. Schueler (1967) too, called for more experimentation with use of media, and more careful consideration of the variables within each study. Williams (1968) listed a number of areas for future research pertinent to a program employing instructional alternatives. He suggested investigation of which agents would be most effective for giving feedback, knowledge of results, or reinforcement, i.e. the teacher, the device, fellow students, etc. He also wanted inquiry into how a well-designed instructional-media device be provided with built-in creativity developmental techniques, and how media can be designed or used to permit an open system which encourages multiple approaches and divergent thinking about information being transmitted. Williams also raised the question of how instructional media and students interact in terms of the production of skills relevant to established academic school curricula. Another question to be answered would be, "Is learner-choice as effective as prescribed choice of instructional alternative?"

Further inquiries into each of the specific content areas within the language arts must continue so that teachers and students can continue to improve their communication skills. Some areas particularly open to further investigation are those involving language acquisition, the issues of incidental versus pre-planned instruction; are both equally effective? Traditional versus transformational grammar, formal versus informal approaches to spelling, handwriting and other subjects, creativity and the place for conformity to rules, and the whole maze of studies involving beginning reading are issues inviting a host of questions.

Research in the areas of handwriting, grammar and spelling should also look into the relationship between techniques of teaching and student achievement in writing tasks, rather than on tests.

For research relative to teacher education, it would be useful to learn whether or not success in a program such as the performance-based curriculum is affected by educational background of the students. It might be valuable to seek information on the relationship, if any, between the speed with which a student completed the PCs, or the pacing patterns, or sequence, or kind of IA taken and the success of a student in the METEP study. The hierarchy, too, ought to be scrutinized. Are the skills dependent on each other? What is the minimal level of performance required? Should a fifth step, evaluation, be added? Or does diagnosis imply this? If so, should diagnosis and approach be a circular procedure, in other words, diagnose, select approach, evaluate-diagnose, select an approach, ad infinitum? How many PCs should future students be required to select? Should some PCs carry more credit than others? Which PCs, if any, are intrinsically more valuable than others? Has the level of competency been set realistically? All these and many more questions must be investigated. One of the major values of the program lies in its built-in commitment to continued investigations, evaluations, and change. It is hoped that this model will produce a new kind of education, open to improvement, welcoming new ideas.

# REFERENCES

Aaron, I.E. What teachers and prospective teachers know about phonic generalizations. Journal of Educational Research. 1968, 53, 323-30.

Allen, D.W. How you can individualize instruction right now. Nation's Schools. 1968, 81, 43-51.

Allen, D.W., Cooper, J. Model Elementary teacher education program, final report University of Massachusetts, Project No. 8-9023, Grant No. OEG-08-089023-3312(010), U.S. Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Bureau of Research, October, 1968.

Allen, D.W. and McDonald, F.J. The effects of self-selection on learning in programmed instruction. American Educational Research Journal, 1966. 3, 1-7.

Ammerman, H.L. et al. The derivation, analysis, and classification of instructional objectives. Technical Report 66-4, May, 1966. The George Washington University, Contract DA 44-188-ARO-2, Defense Documentation Center, Department of the Army.

Ammons, M.A. An empirical study of progress and product in curriculum development. Journal of Educational Research. 27, 1964, 451-457.

Anderson, P.S. Language skills in elementary education, New York: Macmillan, 1967.

Applegate, M. Helping children write. Evanston, Illinois: Row Peterson, 1954.

Arbuthnot, M.H. Children and books. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1957.

Austin, M.C. and Huebner, M.H. Evaluating progress in reading through informal procedures. The Reading Teacher. 1962, 15, 338-343.

Ausubel, D.P. A cognitive-structure theory of school learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Instruction, some contemporary view-points. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967.

Bandura, A. Behavioral modifications through modeling procedures. In Krasner and L.P. Ullman (Eds.), Research in Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Bellack, A.A. History of curriculum thought and practice. Review of Educational Research. 1969, 39, 283-292.

Bissett, D.J. Poems and verses about the city. San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Company, 1968.

Black, H. The American schoolbook. New York: Morrow, 1967.

Bloom, B. S. (Ed.), Taxonomy of educational objectives: the classification of educational goals. Handbook I: cognitive domain. New York: David McKay, 1956.

Bloom, B. S. Learning for mastery. To be published in B. S. Bloom, Hastings, and Madaus. Formative and summative evaluation of student learning. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Bolvin, J. O. and Glaser, R. Developmental aspects of individually prescribed instruction. Audiovisual Instruction. 1968, 13, 828-31.

Briggs, L. J. Learner variables and educational media. Review of Educational Research. 1968, 38, 160-176.

Briggs, L. J. and others. Instructional media: a procedure for the design of multi-media instruction, a critical review of research, and suggestions for future research. Monograph No. 2. Pittsburgh, Pa.: American Institutes for Research, 1967.

Bruner, J. S. Toward a theory of instruction. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966. (Republished: New York, W. W. Norton, 1968.)

Carroll, J. B. A model of school learning. Teachers College Record, 1963, 64, 723-733.

Chall, J. S. Learning to read: the great debate. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Cooper J. Jr. and Gaeth, J. H. Interactions of modality with age and with meaningfulness in verbal learning. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1967, 58, 41-44.

Cooper, J. M. A performance curriculum for teacher education. The second annual Florence B. Stratemeyer lecture. Stanford Univ., February 16, 1967.

Cronbach, L. J. How can instruction be adapted to individual differences? In R. M. Gagne' (Ed.), Learning and individual differences. Columbus, Ohio: Chas. E. Merrill, 1967, Pp. 23-44.

Cronbach, L. J. and Snow, R. E. Final Report: Individual differences in learning ability as a function of instructional variables. Stanford, Calif.: School of Education, Stanford Univ., March 1969.

Cruickshank, D. R. Broadbent, F. W., and Bubb, R. L. Teaching problems laboratory. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1967.

Darrow, H. F. and Howes, V. M. Approaches to individualized reading. New York: Appleton - Century-Crofts, 1960.

Dechant E. V. Improving the teaching of reading. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Dolch, E. W. How to diagnose children's reading difficulties by informal classroom techniques. The Reading Teacher. 1953, 6, 10-14.

Dove, Adrian. The Dove counter-balance intelligence test. Mimeo-paper, unpublished.

Dressel, P. L. (Ed.), Evaluation in general education. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown, 1954.

Duker, S. Listening bibliography. New York: The Scarecrow Press, 1964.

Duker, S. Individualized reading: an annotated bibliography. Metuchen, N.J.: the Scarecrow Press, 1968.

Durkin, D. Phonics and the teaching of reading. New York: Teachers College Press, 1965.

Durkin, D. Teaching them to read. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1970.

Durr W. K. (Ed.), Reading instruction: dimensions and issues. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967.

Edling, J. W. Educational objectives and educational media. Review of Educational Research. 1968, 38, 177-194.

Eisner, E. W. Educational objectives: help or hindrance? The School Review, 1967, 75, 250-260.

Eisner, E. W. Instructional and expressive educational objectives: their formulation and use in curriculum. Instructional objectives, AERA Monograph Series on Curriculum Evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969, Pp 1-18.

Ericksen, S. C. The zigzag curve of learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Instruction, some contemporary view-points. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967, Pp. 141-180.

Fargo, G. A. and others. Comparability of group television and individual administration of the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test: implications for screening. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1967, 58, 137-40.

Feagles, A. Casey the utterly impossible horse. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Finn, J. D. The emerging technology of education. In R. A. Weisgerber (Ed.), Instructional process and media innovation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968, Pp. 289-327.

Frost, J. L. (Ed.) Issues and innovations in the teaching of reading. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1967.

Gagne' R. M. The implications of instructional objectives for learning.

In C. M. Lindvall (Ed.), Defining educational objectives. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964, Pp. 37-44.

Gagne', R. M. The Conditions of learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965.

Gagne', R. M. Instruction and the conditions of learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Instruction, some contemporary view-points, San Francisco: Chandler, 1967, Pp. 291-316.

Glaser, R. and Reynolds, J. H. Instructional objectives and programmed instruction: a case study. In C.M. Lindvall (Ed.), Defining instructional objectives. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1964, Pp. 47-76.

Grahame, K. The reluctant dragon. New York: Macmillan, 1964.

Hatchett, E. L. and Hughes, D. H. The teaching of language arts in the schools. New York: Ronald Press, 1956.

Heilman, A. W. Phonics in proper perspective. Columbus, Ohio: Chas. E. Merrill, 1969.

Householder, D. L. Techniques and modes of instruction. Review of Educational Research. 1968, 38, 382-394.

Huck, C. S. The changing character of basic reading materials. In J. L. Frost (Ed.), Issues and Innovations in the teaching of reading. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1967.

James, N. E. Personal preference for method as a factor in learning. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1962, 53, 43-47.

Jenkinson, M. D. Research pertinent to the training of reading teachers. Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, 1968.

Joyce, B. R. The teacher and his staff: man, media, and machines. Washington D. C.: N.E.A., 1967.

Kerfoot, J. F. Reading in the elementary school. Review of Educational Research. 1967, 37, 121-133.

Krathwohl, D. R. Taxonomy of educational objectives - its use in curriculum building. In C.M. Lindvall, Defining educational objectives. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1964, Pp. 19-36.

Krathwohl, D. R., Bloom, B. S., and Masia, B. B. Taxonomy of educational objectives: the classification of educational goals. Handbook II: affective domain. New York: David McKay, 1964.

LaGrone, H. F. A proposal for the revision at the pre-service professional component of a program of teacher education. Washington D.C.: AACTE, 1964.

Lamb, P. Linguistics in proper perspective. Columbus, Ohip: Chas. E. Merrill, 1967.

Lee, D. M. and Allen, R. V. Learning to read through experience. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Leonard, E. M., Deman, D. D. and Miles, L. E. Basic learning in the language arts. Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1965.

Lewis, C. S. Prince Caspian. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1951.

Lindvall, C. M. (Ed.) Defining educational objectives. Pittsburgh: Univ. of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Lumsdaine, A. A. and Mary, M. A. Mass communication and educational media. Annual Review of Psychology. 1965, 16, 475-534.

MacLennan, D. W. and Reid, C. Research on instructional television and film: An annotated bibliography. Stanford, Calif.: Institute for Communication Research, Stanford University, 1964. (unpaged mimeo)

Mager, R. F. Preparing instructional objectives. Palo Alto, Calif: Fearon, 1962.

Mager, R. Developing attitude toward learning. Palo Alto, Calif.: Fearon, 1968.

McCracken, R. A. Establishing guidelines for effective in-service programs in reading. Paper presented at the International Reading Association Conference, Boston, April, 1968.

McKeegan, H. F. What individualizing instruction means to the curriculum director. Audiovisual Instruction. 1968, 13, 232-237.

McNeil, J. D. Forces influencing curriculum: formulating instructional objectives. Review of Educ. Res. 1969, 39, 293-318.

Meierhenry, W. C. Relationships of media and the curriculum. In R. A. Weisgerber (Ed.), Instructional process and media innovation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968, Pp. 3-17.

Melnik, A. The formulation of questions as an instructional-diagnostic tool. In A. Beery, T. C. Barrett, and W. R. Powell (Eds.), Elementary Reading Instruction: selected materials. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1969, Pp. 251-258.

Moffett, J. Teaching the universe of discourse. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1968.

New York City Board of Education. Toward better speech. Curriculum Bulletin number 5. New York: Bd. of Educ., 1953.

Oettinger A. G. Myths of educational technology. Education Digest, 1968, 34, 5-8.

Olson, A. V. Reading: the approaches we use. In W. K. Durr (Ed.), Reading instruction: dimensions and issues. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1967, Pp. 13-19.

Openshaw, M. K. Validating the content of teacher education. Paper presented at the conference honoring Florence B. Stratemeyer, French Lick, Indiana, June 1965.

Ousley, O. and Russell, D. H. Teacher's Manual for We are neighbors. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1966.

Petty, W. T. (Ed.) Issues and problems in the elementary language arts. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1968.

Popham, W. J. Curriculum materials. Review of Educational Research. 1969a, 39, 319-338.

Popham, W. J. Objectives and instruction. Instructional objectives, A.E.R.A. monograph series on curriculum evaluation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969b, Pp. 32-52

Possien, W. M. They all need to talk. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969.

Pressey, S. L. Teaching machine (and learning theory) crisis. Journal of Applied Psychology. 1963, 47, 1-6.

Reid, J. C. and MacLennan, D. W. Research in instructional television and film, Washington D.C.: Bureau of Research, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1967.

Roberts, P. Teacher's edition, the Roberts English series. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1966.

Rogers, C. R. The facilitation of significant learning. In L. Siegel (Ed.), Instruction, some contemporary view-points. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967, Pp. 37-54.

Rohwer, W. D. Jr. and others. Pictorial and verbal factors in the efficient learning of paired associates. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1967, 58, 278-84.

Schramm, W. S. Research on programmed instruction: an annotated bibliography. Washington D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1964.

Schueler, H. and Lesser, G. S. Teacher education and the new media. Washington D. C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1967.

Shane, H. G. and Mulry, J. G. Improving language arts instruction through research. Washington D. C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1963.

Sheldon, W. D. and Lashinger, D. R. A summary of research studies relating to language arts in elementary education. Elementary English, 1969, 46, 866-885.

Siegel, L. (Ed.) Instruction, some contemporary view-points. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967.

Smith, B. O. Critical thinking. In Recent research and developments and their implications for teacher education, 30th Yearbook. Washington, D. C.: A.A.C.T.E., 1960 Pp. 84-96.

Smith, J. A. The creative teaching of reading and literature in the elementary school. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1967.

Snow, R. E. Aptitude - instructional treatment interactions: selected findings and hypotheses. Paper presented at a meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, February, 1969.

Snow, R. E., Tiffin, J., and Seibert, W. F. Individual differences and instructional film effects. Journal of Educational Psychology. 1965, 56, 315-26.

Spitzer, L. K. Selected materials on the language - experience approach to reading instruction: an annotated bibliography. Newark: International Reading Association, 1967.

Spolin, V. Improvisation for the theatre. Evanston, Illinois: North Western University Press, 1966.

Taba, H. Curriculum development: theory and practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, 1962.

Thelen, H. Materials that promote inquiry and thinking. Educational Screen and Audiovisual Guide, 1965, 44, 25-46.

Tyler, R. W. Basic principles of curriculum and instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Tyler, R. W. Some persistent questions on the defining of objectives. In C. M. Lindvall (Ed.), Defining educational objectives. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1964.

Veatch, J. Reading in the elementary school. New York: Ronald Press, 1966.

Walberg, H. J. A model for research in instruction. Paper read at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, December, 1968.

Wallen, C. J. and others. Training teachers to determine learner achievement of objectives in reading instruction. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, February, 1969.

Wallen, N. E., and Travers, R. M. W. Analysis and investigation of teaching methods. In N. L. Gage (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1963, Pp. 448-505.

Ward, W. Drama with and for children. Wahington, D. C.: U.S. Office of Education, OE-33007, 1960.

Watson, P. G. Instructional strategies and learning systems. Audio-visual Instruction. 1968, 13, 842-846.

Webb, E., Campbell, D., and others. Unobtrusive Measures. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966.

West, W. W. Written composition. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 37, 159-167.

Williams, F. E. Creativity: theoretical and practical considerations for media. In R. A. Weisgerber (Ed.) Instructional process and media innovation. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1968, Pp. 62-86.

Wilson, M. A. The evaluation of a performance-based teacher education curriculum in the language arts. Un-published doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusett, 1970.

Woodruff, A. D. Cognitive models of learning and instruction. In Siegel, L. (Ed.), Instruction, some contemporary view-points. San Francisco: Chandler, 1967, Pp. 55-98.

Yarington, D. Personal communication, 1969.

# APPENDIX

This appendix is arranged so that all information distributed to the students appears in the same order as the Feasibility Study PCs. That is, handouts for PC 1 are first, with the Feasibility handout appearing before the Follow-up handout. Please consult the Table of Contents for page numbers of specific pieces of information. The appendix contains all forms and information referred to in the main body of the dissertation.

METEP
Reading and Language Arts
Performance Criteria

PC 1 Select 3 readers, each published by a different company, and complete the evaluation form for each. Each reader must be on the same grade level.

PC 2 Participate in a discussion of the value of basal readers in American Elementary Schools. Attendance will be taken (est. time: 1 hr.)

PC 3 Administer an informal reading inventory to a child, and score the inventory on the score sheet supplied. Submit the score sheet to a rater.

PC 4 You will be given a description of a class. On the basis of the information supplied, group this class reading instruction and supply your rationale.

PC 5 Select paragraphs from children's readers and construct a quiz containing seven questions. Each question must test a different comprehension skill. You may select any seven of the following: finding the main idea, seeing sequence of ideas, recalling details, drawing conclusions, making inferences, predicting outcomes, classifying, differentiating between fact and opinion, selecting and evaluating information, forming an opinion on information given, seeing relationships, ascertaining author's intent, tone, and mood. Do not include any questions answerable by "yes" or "no".

PC 6 Choose a selection from any child's book, ten sentences in length. Underline at least three words in the selection. Write three lesson plans, each demonstrating a different technique for teaching how to analyze the underlined words in this passage.

PC 7 Successfully pass, with a grade of 70% or above, the administered Phonics test.

PC 8 You will be given a reader from a linguistic series. Distinguish what features make this a linguistic reader. Note control of vocabulary, "irregular" words, use of pictures and content. Submit no more than one typewritten page.

PC 9 You will be given two sentences written in t.o. (traditional orthography). Transcribe these sentences into i/t/a and write two paragraphs agreeing or disagreeing with the following statement: "Using i/t/a with beginning readers solves many problems in the teaching of reading." You will be rated on the specificity and number of valid rationales you provide.

PC 10 Describe a class (using the form supplied). List five different materials for use in a language - experience reading approach. Describe in detail how you would use them.

PC 11 Conduct an initial interview with each of three children for the purpose of assessing their interests and attitudes toward reading. Fill out the information sheet and submit it to a rater.

PC 12 Select three devices and/or kits from the list located in the Reading-Study office in Montague House. Make an appointment to have your demonstration rated.

PC 13 Select a description of a class containing the special population of your choice. Design one week's instructional activities for this class. You will be rated on your objectives, your originality, and the diversity of your activities as well as the appropriateness of your program.

PC 14 Imagine that you have $100.00 to spend on your personal reading and language arts library. List your selections and make a comment, one sentence in length, on your reason for making each expenditure. You may select professional tests, as well as one-year subscriptions to journals. Submit your list to a rater.

PC 15 Describe a class of 20 children (using form supplied). Select one reading objective from the list supplied and present three alternative methods of evaluating the objective.

PC 16 Watch a taped demonstration of an individualized intelligence test, and take the Dove IQ Test. Participate in a discussion afterward.

PC 17 Describe a class of approximately 20 children on the form supplied. List 25 books appropriate for a library for this class. Supply a short rationale for each selection. Submit this list to the rater.

PC 18 Select a passage in a children's book. Prepare to read it orally. You will be required to read the selection out loud, as though to an audience. You will be rated on your eye contact, variation of vocal and facial expression and your fluency in reading the selection.

PC 19 Select a story. Write three lesson plans each describing a different, appropriate way of presenting this story to children. You may use any media, materials, or techniques of your choice.

PC 20 Describe a class of 20 children on the form supplied. Write three lesson plans, each using a different activity aimed at motivating creative writing. You will be rated on the originality, diversity, and appropriateness of your plans.

PC 21 You will be given a list of 50 spelling words. Select 20 of these, and describe one formal and one informal approach to teaching these words. You will be rated on the comprehensiveness and originality of your approaches.

PC 22 You will be given two sentences of 10 words each. Demonstrate your ability to write legibly in manuscript and cursive forms on the chalkboard. You will be rated foremost on legibility, partly on spacing and formation of letters.

PC 23 Describe a class of 20 students, using the form supplied. Describe three different dramatic activities, at least two of which are informal. You will be rated on the appropriateness, originality and diversity of your activities, as well as the specificity of your descriptions.

PC 24 Describe a class of 20 students using the form supplied. Select an appropriate speech objective from the list supplied and describe three alternative methods for achieving the objective. You will be rated on the specificity of your description, the appropriateness of the objective and methods, and the originality of methods.

PC 25 Describe a class of 20 students on the form supplied. Select an appropriate listening objective from the list supplied, and describe three alternative methods for achieving the objective. You will be rated on the specificity of your description, the appropriateness of the objective and methods, and the originality of the methods.

PC 26 Compile an annotated bibliography of 25 items on a topic of your choice in any area of reading or language arts. You will be rated on diversity of material and applicability of the references in the bibliography to your topic. Restrict your comments to two sentences per item.

PC 27 You will be given the statement, "Readiness for reading involves a combination of factors which a teacher of reading must consider". Write a paper no more than three typewritten pages in length developing this statement. You will be rated on specificity and comprehensiveness of the readiness factors.

PC 28 You will be given the statement: "Beginning Reading Instruction must include procedures for acquiring word analysis skills and procedures for memorizing whole words." Write a paper of no more than two typewritten pages in length either defending or attacking the statement.

The following IAs were offered in the feasibility study in addition to a lecture for each PC.

PC 1 Library examination of materials, especially teachers' manuals, in the elementary textbook section of the Education library.

PC 2 This was an expressive objective, and contained no IAs.

PC 3 Practice in classroom*
TV tape demonstrating the administration of the informal reading inventory.

PC 4 Library folder of reading materials containing descriptions and rationale for different kinds of grouping
Observation in the classroom*

PC 5 Library folder containing articles on reading comprehension, questioning techniques, and discussions of levels of questioning (Bloom's taxonomy)

PC 6 TV tapes containing sample five-minute demonstrations of word attack techniques.

PC 7 Programmed text on phonics (Robert Wilson, Programmed Word Attack for Teachers) Library folder containing articles on the teaching of reading by the phonic approach, plus information on phonics content.

PC 8 Library folder of articles discussing the linguistic approach.

PC 9 Library folder of i/t/a manuals, materials, and articles, presenting different points of view about i/t/a
Filmstrip and record published by i/t/a describing the program.

PC 10 Film, Skippy and the Three R's demonstrating the experience approach to teaching reading.

PC 11 Library folder of sample individualized reading lessons and discussions of individualized reading.
Books on reserve in the library:
A Practical Guide to Individualized Reading (N.Y.C. Board of Education), Approaches to Individualized Reading (Darrow and Howes)

PC 12 Individual practice in the reading studies office on a self-scheduled basis.

*for all observation and practice IAs sign-up sheets were available in the Mark's Meadow elementary school.

PC 13 Observation in classes*
Library folder containing descriptions of special populations

PC 14 Browsing in the library

PC 15 Library folder containing excerpts of articles presenting varied points of view on, and suggestions for different evaluative techniques.

PC 16 No IAs. This was an expressive objective

PC 17 Library reading list of professional texts on children's literature.

PC 18 TV tape demonstrating effective presentations of stories.

PC 19 Same TV tape as for PC 18.

PC 20 Reading list of professional texts dealing with creative writing
Observation of creative writing lessons*

PC 21 Reading list of professional texts dealing with spelling.
Observation of spelling lessons*

PC 22 Packet of materials from various publishers containing charts illustrating handwriting and suggesting handwriting lessons.
Self-directed practice

PC 23 TV tapes demonstrating informal and formal dramatics in the classroom

PC 24 Reading list of professional texts dealing with speech

PC 25 List of listening objectives for self-study

PC 26 Library browsing

PC 27 Reading list of professional texts on readiness
Observation in kindergarten and first grade classes*

PC 28 List of professional texts on beginning reading
TV tapes demonstrating lessons in beginning reading

## Follow-up Study

Observation, practice, and discussions were offered for each PC. Included here are instructional alternatives in additions to those offered during feasibility:

PC 1 Audio tape describing different publishers' materials.
Library folder containing descriptions of different publishers' approaches, and articles expressing different points of view about the different approaches.

PC 2 The same IA's were offered for this PC as for PC 1, even though it was termed an expressive objective.

PC 3 TV tape of "Sesame Street" was added to the IA's on readiness (formerly PC 27).
A folder of readings was compiled, dealing with readiness factors, exercises for aiding readiness, and different points of view regarding the nature-nurture controversy.
Audio tape discussing readiness was added.

PC 4 Audio tape discussing the purpose of reading groups, different kinds of groups, and ideas for grouping arrangements.

PC 5 PC 5 was now the informal reading inventory (formerly PC 3).
Audio tape discussing informal reading inventories and how to administer them.
Audio tape of an informal reading inventory administered to a child.

PC 6 This was now the comprehension PC (formerly PC 5)
Audio tape discussing comprehension skills, questioning techniques, and the application of Bloun's taxonomy to the PC.

PC 7 This was formerly PC 6.
Audio tape discussing word analysis and various techniques for teaching it.
Games and devices to serve as samples of teaching techniques for word analysis.
Folder containing information and materials on word analysis.

PC 8 This was formerly PC 7.
Audio tape discussing phonic content and the phonic approach to teaching reading.

PC 9 Audio tape discussing i/t/a.

PC 10 This was PC 8
Audio tape discussing the Linguistic approach to teaching reading.

PC 11 This was PC 10.
Audio tape discussing the Experience approach to teaching reading.
Samples of Experience books for students to examine.
Folder in library, containing information about the Experience approach.

PC 12 This was PC 11.
Audio tape discussing individualized reading.
TV tape demonstrating a classroom using this approach.

PC 13 This was PC 12.
TV tape demonstrating use of kits and machines.
Library folder containing manuals for using the kits and machines.

PC 14 This was PC 13.
Audio tape discussing special populations and giving ideas and principles for working with different kinds of children.

PC 15 This was a combination of PC's 14 and 26.
No new IA's were offered.

PC 16 This was PC 15.
Audio tape describing the process of evaluation and suggestions for techniques of evaluation.

PC 17 This was PC 16. It remained an expressive objective.

PC 18 This was PC 17.
Audio tape discussing children's books and children's interests and giving suggestions for book selection.
Library folder discussing the same as above.

PC 19 Audio tape describing different techniques for presenting stories.
Library folder describing different techniques for presenting stories.

PC 20 This was PC 18.
Audio tape demonstrating and discussing how to read and tell a story.

PC 21 This was PC 20.
Audio tape discussing creative writing and its motivation.
Library folder containing experts' points of view concerning creative writing, and some samples of motivating techniques.

PC 22 This was PC 21.
Audio tape discussing the teaching of spelling, and presenting various points of view and formats of teaching spelling.
Library folder containing articles, sample lessons, and discussions of spelling.

PC 23 This was PC 25.
Audio tape discussing listening goals and techniques.
Library folder containing articles, ideas, and techniques for teaching listening.

PC 24 Audio tape discussing speech goals and techniques.
Library folder containing articles, excerpts, and techniques for teaching speech.

PC 25 This was PC 23.
Audio tape discussing drama, formal and informal.
Library folder containing exerpts of texts, articles, ideas, and techniques for using drama in the classroom.

PC 26 This did not exist in the feasibility study.
Audio tape discussing grammar, traditional and transformational approaches to teaching it.
Library folder containing information and articles on the teaching of grammar.

PC 27 This was PC 23.
Audio tape describing how to form letters, and offering suggestions for teaching writing.
Library folder containing samples of alphabets, ideas for lessons, and different points of view on handwriting.

LESSON PLAN FORM METEP - LANG. ARTS

A good lesson should be carefully planned. The following elements should be included in any good lesson:

I. One main aim
(Subsidiary aims are acceptable, but one aim should predominate)

II. Motivation
What will make the children eager to accomplish the aim, and to participate in the lesson?

III. Materials
What will you need for the lesson? Books? Paper? Movie Projector? Where will you get them?

IV. Method
How will you teach the lesson? What questions will be useful? Will you group? Individualize? Play a game?

V. Evaluation
Did you accomplish your aim? How do you know?

Description of Class

(for PC's 10, 15, 17, 20, 23, 24, 25) METEP, LANG. ARTS

1. Grade_____Number_____# of boys_____# of girls_____

2. Location of School

   Description of Location

3. Socio-economic level of students

4. Racial and ethnic description

5. Intelligence

6. Attitudes of children toward school

7. Usual response level of children (in terms of excitement and lethargy)

8. Behavior in class

9. Special interests of children

10. Special problems

11. Other

Name_____ METEP Language Arts PC 1
Date_____

Publishers' Evaluation Form

Be specific, not general, in your responses. (Use reverse side if necessary.)

Publisher_____ Publication Date_____

Name of Book_____ Grade Level_____

I. Publisher's stated purpose.

A. What is the primary objective of the series as stated by the publisher?

B. Where is the major emphasis placed? (word attack? comprehension? content? other?)

II. Approach.

A. List the steps recommended for teaching a story in the text.

B. What skills are stressed?

C. How helpful is the manual to you?

D. Comment on the numbers of new words introduced and on the vocabulary in general.

III. Content.

A. To what extent is the content appropriate to children's interests, experiences, and needs?

B. List the variety of styles and forms included (i.e. poetry, fiction, etc.).

C. Describe the socio-economic, racial, and general nature of the characters in the stories.

D. Discuss the literary quality of the content.

E. Comment on the illustrations.

IV. Evaluation.

A. How would you like using this text with a class?

B. The worst thing about this text is:

C. The best thing about this text is:

Publisher_____Publication Date_____

Name of Book_____Grade Level_____

I. Publisher's stated purpose.

A. What is the primary objective of the series as stated by the publisher?

B. In what special way does the series attempt to meet the objective?

II. Approach.

A. List the steps recommended for teaching a story in the text.

B. What skills are stressed?

C. How helpful is the manual to you?

D. Comment on the number of new words introduced and on the vocabulary in general.

III. Content.

A. In your opinion, to what extent is the content appropriate to children's interests, experiences, and needs?

B. List the variety of styles and forms included (i.e., poetry, folk tales, fantasy, etc.).

C. Describe the socio-economic, racial, and general nature of the characters in the stories.

D. Comment on the illustrations.

IV. Evaluation.

A. How would you like using this text with a class?

B. The worst thing about this text is:

C. The best thing about this text is:

D. Compared with the other two texts that I examined, this one:

University of Massachusetts Reading Center
Comprehensive Informal Reading Inventory

Name_____ Date_____

Tester_____

Score Sheet

Part I. Independent Level_____

Instruction Level_____

Part II. Independent Level_____

Instruction Level_____

Part III. Independent Level_____

Instruction Level_____

Part IV. Visual Discrimination_____ (%)

Auditory Discrimination_____ (%)

Alphabet_____ (%)

Vowel sounds_____ (List correct ones)

1. Initial Consonants_____ (%)
2. Final Consonant_____
3. Consonant Blends_____
4. Consonant Digraphs_____
5. Long and short vowel sounds_____
6. Controlled "r"_____
7. "l" and "w" controller_____
8. Silent "gh" and 3 letter blends_____
9. Diphthongs_____
10. Hard and soft "c" and "g"_____
11. Two Consonant letters & final "e"_____
12. Syllabication_____
13. "le" syllabication & "schwa" sound_____
14. Visual discrimination_____

Part V. Oral and Silent Reading Tests

Independent Level_____

Instructional Level_____

Comprehension Level_____

Smoothness of reading_____ Specific Problem_____

Tester's Interpretation:

Information At First Session

Date _____

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone Number _____

Grade Now _____

School _____

Age _____

Teacher's Name _____

Reading situation pupil is in (groups, individual, special, number in class).

How does pupil feel about his reading? Does he have a problem? What is it?

Does he come for help?

Interests

Has he ever been tutored in reading before? Where

University of Massachusetts Reading Center

Comprehensive Informal Reading Inventory

Purpose: To determine the tentative level of difficulty (in terms of reader level) at which the pupil can read comfortably on his own (Independent Level); and the tentative level of difficulty (reader level) at which the pupil can function most appropriately for instructional purposes ("INstructional level").

Procedure: I. Administer Part I (mimeographed word lists)

A tentative independent level is determined by the highest list on which the pupil makes no errors in word recognition.
A tentive instructional level is determined by the list on which the pupil makes his first error of recognition.

II. Administer Part II (Bucks County Test)

Tentative Independent and instructional levels are determined the same as in Part I.

III. Administer paragraphs from the middle of a basal reader series (preferabley one pupil does not use in school), or the mimeographed paragraphs in this package. Initiate testing at tentative independent level as judged by Parts I and II; and proceed until appropriate independent and instructional levels are established as explained below.

Select one story sample of 100 words or more. Keep a record of errors for diagnosis and guide to future teaching, using same scoring system.

The tentative independent level is determined by the level of the reader in which the pupil reads with a minimum of 99% accuracy.

The tentative instructional level is determined by the level of the reader in which the pupil reads with a minimum of 95% accuracy (one error per twenty running words.)

Make an adequate check of the pupils comprehension of the content which he reads by asking two fact questions and three inferential questions.

IV. Administer Word Analysis Inventory if it seems to be indicated by specific failure in word attack in the earlier parts of the test.

## Directions for Scoring

1. The pupil reads one copy; you score another copy (Teacher's copy).

2. Check (✓) correct words. (If pupil hesitates but gets it correct in 4 seconds, it is correct).

3. Underscore with a straight line all words or syllables which are wholly mispronounced or scuttled.

4. Use accent marks to indicate how an incorrectly stressed work is mispronounced.

5. Encircle words and syllables which are omitted. (Give four seconds and supply the word if pupil does not attack it).

6. Write in any insertions or substitutions.

7. Underscore with a wavy line all words and syllables which are repeated.

8. At the end of each list, point out words pupil missed and ask him again. If correct, check it (this would be a visual discrimination error). If pupil makes a mistake a second time, circle word (this would be a word recognition error).

9. Note at end of each list if pupil pronounces the words smoothly, slowly, etc.

10. Count only the word recognition errors as mistakes.

11. Score each sheet at the top of each test and tabulate on the cover sheet.

# RECORD OF INFORMAL READING INVENTORY

Tester's Name _____ Date of Test _____

Child's Name _____ Class _____

Title & Publisher of Book Used _____ Grade Level _____ Page(s) _____

## Errors Made

| UNSPOKEN | SPOKEN | |
|---|---|---|
| (Wait 5 seconds, then tell the child the word list the words here.) | CHILD SAID (List phonetically, if possible). | ACTUAL WORD |

Reading level: instructional -- frustration -- independent -- (check one)

RECORD OF INFORMAL READING INVENTORY (cont'd)

NEEDS: Check these to construct a program of instruction for the child.

Basic sight vocabulary

Context

Initial consonants

Final consonants

Consonant blends

Consonant digraphs

Short vowels

Long vowels

Vowel digraphs

Other vowel sounds

Endings

Prefixes

Compund words

Contractions

Syllabication

Ignores Punctuation

Reads word-by-word

Reads too quickly

Needs work on comprehension

Other Comments:

METEP Language Arts
PC 4

Name_____ Date_____

READING GROUPS

GROUP I

Description -

| NAME OF STUDENT | RATIONALE |
|---|---|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |
| 5. | |
| 6. | |
| 7. | |
| 8. | |
| 9. | |
| 10. | |
| 11. | |
| 12. | |

GROUP II

Description -

| NAME OF STUDENT | RATIONALE |
|---|---|
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |
| 5. | |
| 6. | |
| 7. | |
| 8. | |
| 9. | |
| 10. | |
| 11. | |
| 12. | |

GROUP III

Description -

| NAME OF STUDENT | RATIONALE |
| --- | --- |
| 1. | |
| 2. | |
| 3. | |
| 4. | |
| 5. | |
| 6. | |
| 7. | |
| 8. | |
| 9. | |
| 10. | |
| 11. | |
| 12. | |

PC 7 Pre-test

Matching (Place the proper letter on each answer-space at the left)

| | |
|---|---|
| ___ unworkable, disorganizing, merrier | A. inflectional endings |
| ___ paid, meal, coat, peel | B. final e rule |
| ___ bin, din, pin, sin, tin | C. consonant blends |
| ___ rewrap, antibodies, displease, unclean | D. vowel digraphs |
| ___ flag, dry, strike, scream | E. roots |
| ___ radio, she, mind, go, using | F. consonants |
| ___ can, cane; met, mete; win, wine; rod, rode; us, use | G. short vowels |
| ___ playground, downhill, roadside | H. diphthongs |
| ___ mad, ten, hit, pot, rust | I. prefixes |
| ___ fight, might, right; would, could, should | J. consonant substitution |
| ___ hands, country's, nicely, heaviest | K. long vowels |
| ___ oil, house, toy, cow | L. phonograms |
| ___ shy, than, chore, whistle, sung, wink | M. suffixes |
| ___ poisonous, kindness, reasonable | N. consonant digraphs |
| ___ zebra, yam, bottle, ail, ago | O. compounds |
| ___ about, taken, imitate, button, column | P. schwa sound |

METEP LANGUAGE ARTS

P.C. 7 Post-test

Matching (Place the proper letter on each answer-space at the left)

____ enjoyable, meanness, odorous

____ city, zebra, hot, lap

____ mismanagement, disrespect, happiness

____ sap, lap, rap, cap

____ displease, recount, undo, misspell

____ crush, strangle, brought, flood

____ bravest, bunches, speaker, owing

____ he, hero, acre, kind, duty

____ scene, slave, tube, rope, wise

____ floorplan, bookkeeper, stockpile, underwear

____ mutton, balance, hospital, medical, finger

____ about, taken, imitate, button, column

A. suffixes

B. consonant blends

C. compound words

D. final e rule

E. short vowels

F. inflectional endings

G. roots

H. consonant substitution

I. prefixes

J. consonants

K. long vowels

L. dipthongs

M. schwa sound

METEP NUMBER _____ DATE _____

NAME _____

# PHONICS QUIZ

DO NOT GUESS

1. CIRCLE THE SCHWA SOUNDS (IF ANY) IN THE FOLLOWING WORDS: UNIVERSE, PURPOSE, ANIMAL, BOOKCASE, ROSES.

2. CIRCLE THE CONSONANT DIGRAPHS (IF ANY) IN THE FOLLOWING WORDS: FEATHER, STREAM, SUNSHINE, STORM, STRETCH, SCENE, GOING.

3. CIRCLE THE DIPHTHONGS (IF ANY) IN THE FOLLOWING WORDS: VOYAGE, MINE, VOWEL, POISON, WEAPON.

4. CORRECTLY PLACE A MACRON OR BREVE OVER THE LONG OR SHORT VOWELS IN THE FOLLOWING WORDS: SCENE, CRUSH, FINGER, BALANCE, TRIBE, OVER, RECKON.

5. CIRCLE THE CONSONANT BLENDS (IF ANY) IN THE FOLLOWING WORDS: SCHOOL, PLEASE, ANYTHING, FRUIT, CHOOSE, SCRAPE.

6. DIVIDE THE FOLLOWING WORDS INTO SYLLABLES BY PLACING A SLANTED LINE BETWEEN THE SYLLABLES (EXAMPLE: GO/ING): MOURNFUL, FIDDLE, BEFORE, EXCITE, CITRON, SYLLABLE.

7. MATCH THE APPROPRIATE PHONIC GENERALIZATION WITH EACH WORD IN THE FIRST COLUMN BY WRITING THE LETTER WHICH IDENTIFIES THE PHONIC GENERALIZATION IN THE BLANK THAT PRECEDES THE WORD.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| ____1. SIT | A. | THE /R/ GIVES THE PRECEDING VOWEL A SOUND THAT IS NEITHER LONG NOR SHORT |
| ____2. INVENT | | |
| ____3. BRAIN | B. | THE FIRST VOWEL IS USUALLY LONG AND THE SECOND SILENT IN THE VOWEL DIGRAPH. |
| ____4. GO | | |
| ____5. FILE | C. | WHEN THERE IS ONLY ONE VOWEL IN A WORD, OR ACCENTED SYLLABLE AND THAT VOWEL DOES NOT COME AT THE END OF THE WORD, T VOWEL IS USUALLY SHORT. |
| ____6. PREVIEW | | |
| ____7. MATE | | |
| ____8. AWFUL | | |
| ____9. SPICE | D. | IF THE ONLY VOWEL IN A WORD OR SYLLABLE IS /A/ FOLLOWED BY /L/ OR /W/ THE /A/ USUALLY IS CONTROLLED BY THE /L/ OR /W/ |
| ____10. HARVARD | | |
| ____11. MOAN | | |
| ____12. BLOAT | E. | IF THERE IS ONLY ONE VOWEL IN A WORD OR ACCENTED SYLLABLE AND IT COMES AT THE END OF THE SYLLABLE, THAT VOWEL USUALLY HAS THE LONG VOWEL SOUND. |
| ____13. BE | | |
| ____14. BORN | | |
| ____15. SCENE | | |
| ____16. FIRST | F. | IF THERE ARE TWO VOWELS IN A WORD OR ACCENTED SYLLABLE, ONE OF WHICH IS THE FINAL /E/, USUALLY THE FIRST VOWEL HAS THE LONG SOUND AND THE FINAL /E/ IS SILENT. |
| ____17. I | | |
| ____18. TALL | | |
| ____19. MEAT | | |
| ____20. MAN | | |

PC 8
METEP, LANG. ARTS

## Linguistic Readers

1. Merrill Linguistic Readers
2. S.R.A. Basic Series
3. I Can Read (Bloomfield-Barnhardt)
4. Harper & Row Linguistic Readers
5. Miami Linguistic Readers (programmed)
6. Sullivan Linguistic Readers (programmed)

These are located in Room 2, School of Education.
Copies may also be found in the Education Library.

PC 9
METEP, LANGUAGE ARTS

Select one passage from the following five and transcribe into i.t.a.

1. In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void.

2. And darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waves.

3. And God said, Let there be light: and there was light. And God saw the light, that it was good.

4. And God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day and the darkness he called night.

5. And God called the firmament heaven. And the evening and the morning were the second day.

METEP Language Arts PC 11

Name_____ Date_____

Interview Information Sheet (use reverse side of sheet if necessary)

Child's Name_____School_____Grade_____

# of Children in Family_____Child's Position in Family_____
(oldest, youngest, etc.)

Brief physical description of child -

Brief impression of child's personality (use string of adjectives) -

I. What are the child's favorite activities outside of school?

II. Does the child have a special hobby?

III. What are the child's least favorite activities outside of school?

IV. What are the child's least favorite activities in school?

V. What are the child's favorite activities in school?

VI. How does the child feel about reading and books?

VII. What are the child's favorite books?

VIII. Summarize the child's interests.

IX. Comment on what you believe are the child's needs.

METEP Language Arts
PC 12

READING DEVICES:

EDL Tachistoscope Projector
To increase speed and span of apprehension of words & figures

Flash-X: a hand-tachistoscope
As above; also to improve vocabulary (when used with Word Clue books)

EDL Controlled Reader Projector
As above; also facilitates left-to-right reading, inhibits regressions; workbooks encourage good study habits

Shadowscope Pacer
To increase speed of reading

Keystone Reading Pacer
As above

KITS:

Science Research Associate Materials:

A multilevel developmental program in reading, writing and spelling designed with regard for children proceeding from their own individual levels at their own rate of speed.

KITS:
Reading for Understanding
Junior Reading for Understanding
Reading Laboratory Part Ib
Reading Laboratory Part IIb
Spelling Word Power Part IIb
Penskill Part II

Educational Developmental Laboratories Study Skills Library:

A multilevel developmental reading program designed to help pupils use reading skills in content areas.

KITS:
Orientation Lesson D-J
Social Studies DD, FF, II
Science I
Reference DDD, EEE, GGG, HHH, III

Rater: Margaret Frerichs
Place: Montague House, 2nd floor front, College Reading Program Office.
Times: 9:00-11:00 a.m. by appointment, 545-2048. Sign-up sheet on the door.

METEP Language Arts

Reading Objectives
PC 15

1. To develop specific phonic analysis skills.
2. To foster a love of reading (turn kids on to books).
3. To assure that each individual is reading up to his capacity (mental grade = reading grade).
4. To identify those children who have gaps in their basic reading skills.
5. To foster critical thinking abilities.
6. To develop literal and/or critical comprehension skills.
7. To increase flexibility in reading rate.
8. To have each child read one book of his own choice, on his own with no such requirement.
9. To foster exposure to a variety of literary forms and content.
10. To teach children to read beyond the primer level.
11. To build a stock of basic sight words.
12. To facilitate auditory and visual discrimination.
13. To teach techniques of reading different kinds of material (textbooks, newspapers, magazines, dictionaries, phone books, etc.).
14. To facilitate the ability to associate symbols and sounds.
15. To facilitate learning meanings of words.

METEP Language Arts
PC 21

# WORD LIST FOR SPELLING

List A

1. southern
2. sky
3. west
4. bright
5. captain
6. geography
7. earth
8. discovered
9. countries
10. desert
11. mountain
12. cannot
13. bridge
14. ocean
15. settled
16. colonies
17. industry
18. common
19. thick
20. court
21. cause
22. market
23. general
24. peace
25. settled
26. careful
27. different
28. world
29. light
30. star
31. over
32. also
33. beard
34. done
35. anxious
36. America
37. laugh
38. comfortable
39. can't
40. wasn't
41. building
42. flood
43. north
44. community
45. control
46. service
47. done
48. department
49. sailor
50. language

METEP Language Arts
PC 24

Name_____ Date_____

Speech Objectives (adapted from New York City Board of Education Toward Better Speech)

Attitude

1. Develop a positive attitude toward the value of effective speech in social and business relations.
2. Develop a desire to participate actively in speech activities for personal self-development and for social group competency.
3. Appreciate and enjoy participating in choral speaking.
4. Develop standards of audience - speaker relations, stressing the mutual responsibilities of speaker and listener.
5. Reinforce the desire to improve general speech pattern.

Voice

1. Habitually use a pleasant, audible voice.
2. Discriminate in the use of quality and volume (includes recognition of and ability to produce gruff, sweet, large and small voices).
3. Adjust quality, volume and pitch to size of room, type of audience, purpose of the speech activity.
4. Vary voice to communicate meaning and effectiveness with creative areas of story telling, dramatics, and choral speaking.
5. Evaluate others' and own voice in terms of effectiveness and appropriateness.

Phrasing, Tempo

1. Use free, rhythmic, natural phrasing in all speaking activities.
2. Stress key words in sentences.
3. Adjust tempo to listeners' responses.
4. Adjust tempo to meaning.

Practical Application

1. Engage in, but do not monopolize conversation.
2. Present oral report in an interesting fashion.
3. Be able to conduct and participate in a meeting under parliamentary procedure.
4. Participate in, but do not monopolize discussion.
5. Lead a discussion, keeping a lively exchange going.
6. Evaluate a group discussion as to exploration of problem, effectiveness of leader, participation of group.
7. Participate happily in choral speaking.
8. Communicate through pantomine.
9. Perform an improvisation.
10. Take part in a play.
11. Tell a story effectively.
12. Conduct an interview.
13. Interpret a poem orally.
14. Conduct a lesson.

Add any others you can think of.

METEP Language Arts

Listening Objectives (Hatchett and Hughes, 1956)
PC 25

1. Identifying main ideas.
2. Remembering significant details.
3. Remembering sequence of ideas.
4. Understanding meanings of words.
5. Understand implications of main ideas.
6. Understand interrelationships among ideas.
7. Judging validity and adequacy of ideas.
8. Judging sufficiency of supporting details.
9. Criticizing organization and development of spoken material.
10. Judging whether speaker has created the intended mood or effect.
11. Recognizing the intent of the speaker.
12. To be able to interpret to the speaker's satisfaction what the speaker has said.
13. Ability to predict and review what the speaker has said.
14. To be able to remember and follow instructions or directions.
15. To enjoy and appreciate stories, plays, music, and other aesthetic experiences.

## THE DOVE COUNTERBALANCE INTELLIGENCE TEST

This test might be useful in evaluating your verbal aptitude. The verbal aptitude tested is not slanted toward middle-class experience, however, but to non-white lower-class experience.

People from a non-white, lower class background are required to do well on aptitude tests keyed to white, middle-class culture, before they are allowed to perform in that culture. As a member of the white middle-class, how would you do on an intelligence test appropriate for the lower class black culture?

The following test was developed by Watts social worker, Adrian Dove, to measure intelligence as the term applies in lower-class Black America.

If your score is less than on the test, you are virtually failing, and might therefore conclude that you have a low ghetto I.Q. As white middle-class educators put it, you are "culturally deprived."

1. "T-Bone Walker" got famous for playing what?
   (a) Trombone (b) Piano (c) "T-flute" (d) Guitar (e) "Hambone"

2. A "Gas Head" is a person who has a:
   (a) Fast moving car (b) Statle of "lace" (c) "process" (d) Habit of stealing cars (e) Long jail record for arson

3. If a man is called "Blood" then he is a:
   (a) Fighter (b) Mexican-American (c) Negro (d) Hungry hemophile (e) Redman or Indian

4. If you throw the dice and "7" is showing on the top, what is facing down?
   (a) Seven" (b) "Snake-eyes" (c) "Boxcars" (d) "Little Joes" (e) "Eleven"

5. Cheap "Chitlinge" (Not the kind you purchase at a frozen-food counter) will taste rubbery unless they are cooked long enough. How soon can you quit cooking them to eat and enjoy them?
   (a) 15 minutes (b) 2 hours (c) 24 hours (d) 1 week (on low flame) (e) 1 hour

6. "Down home" (the South) today, for the average "Soul Brother" who is picking cotton (in season from sunup until sundown) what is the average earning (take home) for one full day?
   (a) $0.75 (b) $1.65 (c) $3.50 (d) $5.00 (e) $12.00

7. If a judge finds you guilty of "holding weed" (in California) what's the most he can give you?
   (a) indeterminate (life) (b) a nickel (c) a dime (d) a year in County (e) $0.00

8. A "Hype" is a person who: (a) always says he feel sickly (b) has water on the brain (c) used heroin (d) is always ripping and running (e) is always sick

9. Hattie Mae Johnson is on the County. She has 4 children and her husband is now in jail for non-support, as he was unemployed and was not able to give her any money. Her welfare check is now $286.00 per month. Last night she went out with the biggest player in town. If she got pregnant, than nine months from now, how much will her welfare check be?
(a) $80.00 (b) -$2.00 (c) $35.00 (d) $150.00 (e) $100.00

10. Do the Beatles have soul? (a) yes (b) no (c) Gee whiz or maybe

11. A handkerchief head is: (a) a coolest (b) a porter (c) an "Uncle Tom" (d) a hoddi (e) a "preacher"

12. "Jet" is: (a) An "East-Oakland Motorcycle club (b) One of the gangs in West Side Story (c) A news and gossip magazine (d) a way of life of the very rich.

13. And Jesus said, "Walk together children....": (a) Don't you get weary. There's a great camp meeting. (b) For we shall overcome (c) For the family that walks together talks together. (d) By your patience you will win your soul (Luke 21:29) (e) Find the things that are above, not the things that are on Earth (Col. 3:3)

14. Bo Diddley is a: (a) camp for children (b) cheap wine (c) singer (d) new dance (e) Mojo call

15. How much does a "Short-dog" cost? (a) $0.05 (b) $2.30 (c) $0.35 (d) $0.86 + tax

Check List for Reading Readiness (Anderson, 1967, pp. 206-208)

(Answer as many of these as you can. Information may not be available for all areas.)

Child's Name _____ Grade_____Age _____

Brief physical description:

| Physical Readiness | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Eyes: | | |
| a. Do the child's eyes seem comfortable? (Does he squint, rub eyes, hold material too close or too far away from eyes?) | _____ | _____ |
| b. Are the results of clinical test or an oculist's examination favorable? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Ears: | | |
| a. Does he respond to questions or directions, and is he apparently able to hear what is said in class? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he respond to low-voice test of twenty feet, a whisper test of fifteen inches? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Is his audiometer test normal? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Speech: | | |
| a. Does he speak clearly and well? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he respond to correction readily? | _____ | _____ |

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| 4. Hand-eye coordination: | | |
| a. Does he make his hands work together well in cutting, using tools, or bouncing a ball? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. General health: | | |
| a. Does he give an impression of good health? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he seem well nourished? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does the school physical examination reveal good health? | _____ | _____ |

Social Readiness

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Cooperation: | | |
| a. Does he work well with a group, taking his share of the responsibility? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he cooperate with the other children in playing games? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Sharing: | | |
| a. Does he share materials without monopolizing their use? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he share his home toys with others? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does he wait his turn in play or games? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Does he await his turn when classwork is being checked by the teacher? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Self-reliance: | | |
| a. Does he work things through for himself? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he work without asking teacher about the next step? | _____ | _____ |

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| c. Does he take care of his clothing and materials? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Does he find anything to do when he finishes an assigned tasks? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Good listening: | | |
| a. Is he attentive? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he listen rather than interrupt? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does he listen to all of a story with evident enjoyment so that he can re-tell all or part of it? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Can he follow simple directions? | _____ | _____ |
| 5. General: | | |
| a. Does he take good care of materials assigned to him? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he follow adult leadership without objection or show of resentment? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does he alter his own methods to profit by an example set by another child? | _____ | _____ |
| Emotional Readiness | | |
| 1. Adjustment to task: | | |
| a. Does the child see a task (such as drawing, preparing for an activity, or cleaning up) through to completion? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he accept changes in school routine calmly? | _____ | _____ |

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| c. Does he appear to be happy and well adjusted in school work, as evidenced by good attendance, relaxed attitude, pride in work, eagerness for a new task? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Poise: | | |
| a. Does he accept a certain amount of opposition without crying or sulking? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Can he meet strangers without unusual shyness? | _____ | _____ |
| Mental Readiness | | |
| 1. Mind set for reading: | | |
| a. Does the child appear interested in books and readings? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he ask the meanings of words or signs? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Is he interested in the shapes of unusual words? | _____ | _____ |
| 2. Mental maturity: | | |
| a. Does the child's mental test show him sufficiently mature to begin reading? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Can he give reasons for his opinions about work of others or his work? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Can he draw something to demonstrate and idea as well as children of his own age? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Is his memory span sufficient to allow memorization of a short poem or song? | _____ | _____ |
| e. Can he tell a story without confusing the order of events? | _____ | _____ |

| | YES | NO |
|---|---|---|
| f. Can he listen or work an average length of time without restlessness? | _____ | _____ |
| g. Can he dramatize a story imaginatively? | _____ | _____ |
| 3. Mental habits: | | |
| a. Has the child established the habit of looking at a succession of items from left to right? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he interpret pictures? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does he grasp the fact that symbols may be associated with pictures or subjects? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Can he anticipate what may happen in a story or poem? | _____ | _____ |
| e. Can he remember the central thought as well as important details? | _____ | _____ |
| 4. Language: | | |
| a. Does he speak clearly? | _____ | _____ |
| b. Does he speak correctly after being helped with a difficulty by the teacher? | _____ | _____ |
| c. Does he speak in sentences? | _____ | _____ |
| d. Does he know the meanings of words that occur in pre-primers and primers? | _____ | _____ |
| e. Does he know certain related words such as up and down, top and bottom, big and little? | _____ | _____ |

Observer's name _____

Date(s) of observation _____

Additional comments _____

_____

# INSTRUCTIONS TO RATERS

1. Evaluation form filled out.
   Don't pass if answers seem only mechanical with no thought process evident.

2. Expressive objective.

3. If form is completed, it is O.K.

4. If there seems to be a rationale, P.C. is O.K.

5. In Folder

6. Same as 20, 23, etc., but look for different ways to analyze words: phonic, structural, sight, content, configuration, etc.

7. Key in folder.

8. Key in folder.

9. Key in folder.

10. Check to see that a diversity of media is used. To pass this, the materials must relate to the class description.

11. Info sheet filled out more than preemptorily; i.e., indication that candidate has gotten the child to talk to him.

12. Margaret F. will take care of this.

13. Objectives should be realistic and observable activities should employ different devices and should be varied. This is almost an expressive objective. Comment if you believe there is either too much or too little going on in one week.

14. Check for diversity - at least a few areas of the language arts should be covered.

    Don't pass if:

    a. Only one area is covered.

    b. Only one kind of book is listed (i.e., all bibliographies, or all encyclopedias or all periodicals).

15. In folder.

16. This will be done in class 10/29

17. Don't pass if:

    a. A rationale is not supplied.

    b. Only one category of books is included.

    c. No books aimed specifically at boys.

    d. If books are inappropriate for class described.

18. Rating scale in folder.

19. Fail if only "telling" or "reading" are suggested. Look for diversity.

20. Rating scale in folder.

21. Rating scale in folder.

22. Pass if:

    a. You can read the words with ease.

    b. The writing is dark enough and large enough.

    c. The spacing aids legibility.

    d. The letters are formed consistently.

    Fail if any <u>one</u> of these factors exists:

    a. You can't read it easily.

    b. The writing is a combination of manuscript and cursive (this is confusing to children).

23. Rating scale in folder.

24. Same as 5, 23, 24, etc.

25. Same as 5, 23, 24, etc.

26. Fail only if:

    a. Only one kind of source was used.

    b. The references or rationales aren't applicable to the topic.

27. Rating sheet in folder.

28. Rating sheet in folder.

INSTRUCTIONS TO RATERS
GUIDELINES TO CONSIDER FOR DISCUSSION
METEP LANGUAGE ARTS PC 2

1. Describe a basal system - does everyone have a common understanding?
2. Describe the uses and activities associated with the basal system in the public school.
3. How do basals differ, one from the other?
4. Suggest ways of improving use of basals.
5. Suggest other materials.

The above are suggested guidelines only. Use your own judgment, when you see how the discussion is going.

Rating Scale PC 5

Main Idea
Recalling Details
Classifying
Differentiating Fact & Opinion
Seeing Sequence of Ideas

Drawing Conclusions
Making Inferences
Predicting Outcomes
Selecting and Evaluating
Forming an Opinion on Information
Seeing Relationships
Ascertaining Author's Intent, Tone and Mood

The major criterion for evaluating the seven questions should be to determine if the answers to the questions fall into the appropriate category, A or B. Questions in category A can be answered by direct quotations from the selection, recalling facts or any specific references to the selection. Questions in category B cannot be answered by direct reference to the selection. They are questions which require some thinking ability on the part of the reader.

Category A questions are literal or straight fact questions.

Category B questions are inferential or reasoning questions.

The rater must first judge if the question requires an appropriate A or B answer, by checking the above chart, then he must judge if the answer required is in fact a fact (A) or reasoning (B) answer.

The rater must also judge if the question does, in fact, tap the kind of comprehension skill desired. This is a very subjective judgment.

METEP Language Arts
PC 6, 20, 23, 24, 25

Rating Scale for Activities

1. Is the activity other than copying, writing or doing something a certain number of times?

2. Does the activity look enjoyable as well as informative?

3. Do the activities differ, one from the other? Is there variety?

4. Are a variety of different materials suggested?

METEP Language Arts
PC 8

Rating Scale for Linguistic Readers

Candidate should include some mention of:

1. Rhyme patterns used extensively.

2. Vowels - short vowel sounds used almost exclusively at first.

3. Illustrations either not used at all (so as to provide outside clues to word attack), or not realistic. Illustrations not necessarily pertinent to content (same reason as above).

4. Spelling patterns used in vocabulary content (words with same sound spelled the same in one story, i.e., "ough" words all together).

5. Few irregular words introduced.

Candidate might also mention:

1. Lack of particular cultural, social, or realistic references in content.

2. Structural pattern of declarative to interrogatory to exclamatory sentences; simple to complex structure.

Check for:

1. Candidate's awareness of difference between this approach and phonics (phonics puts together isolated sounds; linguistics stresses patterns, or groups of sounds).

2. Candidate's awareness that the vocabulary is controlled.

Rating Scale for PC 9 METEP Lang. Arts

A. If candidate agrees he should give at least 3 of the following reasons:

1. The child can more quickly progress to material more commensurate with his intelligence and interests.

2. He may develop greater self-confidence in reading.

3. It may assist in developing more positive attitudes to reading because much frustration is avoided.

4. It enables the child to write with fewer inhibitions.

5. It reduces the number of symbols to be learned (i.e., 66 characters in t.o. as opposed to 44 in i.t.a.).

6. It may assist spelling ability.

Others may be deemed acceptable by the rater.

B. If candidate disagrees he should give at least 3 of the following reasons:

1. There may be too many characters in i.t.a. for the child to learn.

2. The transition period may be very unsettling and frustrating.

3. The child may be confused by the co-existence of 2 alphabets: i.t.a. and t.o.

4. I.t.a. may have an adverse effect on the child's spelling ability.

5. The characters of i.t.a. may be too complicated for the child to write.

6. It may be a waste of time to learn something which soon has to be unlearned.

Others may be deemed acceptable by the rater.

METEP Language Arts PC 15

Rating Scale

Check for:

1. Appropriateness of objective to class description (age, skills, interests, etc.).

2. Evaluation procedures containing:

    a. feasibility, i.e., reasonable amount of time, objectivity of evaluation, general manageability;

    b. diversity of approach. Some suggested approaches are:

        standardized or teacher made tests,

        interviews,

        coded observation,

        unobtrusive measures,

        frequency counts,

        role playing,

        self-report.

Don't pass if:

1. Objective is inappropriate for class described

or

2. Alternatives will not succeed in measuring objectives

or

3. Alternatives are actually all variations of one approach.

METEP Language Arts
PC 18

Rating Scale for Telling a Story Effectively

Does candidate:

1. Look at audience more than at book?
2. Vary volume of voice (loud, soft, medium)?
3. Project voice to listener? (sit at other end of room to hear reading)
4. Look pleasant? or at least not too tense?
5. Vary voice quality, tone, pitch? (not monotonous)
6. Project the meaning?
7. Read fluently?

Do not pass if candidate:

1. Mumbles.
2. Speaks in monotone.
3. Fails to project meaning.
4. Fails to sound involved in the reading.
5. Seldom, if ever, looks up.
6. Reads in too choppy a fashion.

METEP Language Arts
PC 21

Rating Scale for Spelling

Does candidate:

1. Group words that might logically be taught together?
2. Pay attention to meaning as well as analysis?
3. Suggest ways for students to use words?

Do not pass if candidate:

1. Has students write words a number of times each.
2. Pays no attention to meaning or relevance.
3. Does not group at least a few words for teaching together.

METEP Language Arts
PC 27

Factors Involved in Reading Readiness: Rating Scale

1. Students must include four areas of readiness.

   - physical
   - social
   - emotional
   - mental

2. Physical aspects should include consideration of at least three of the following factors:

   - vision
   - hearing
   - speech
   - eye-hand coordination
   - general health

   Social aspects should include consideration of at least two of the following factors:

   - ability to participate actively and co-operatively in group activities
   - degree of self-reliance
   - the ability to share materials with classmates
   - the ability to wait for help from the teacher

   (or any two factors related to social maturity that the rater judges to have a significant bearing on the child's readiness.)

   Emotional aspects should include tow of the following factors:

   - perserverance
   - stability
   - security

   (or any other two factors deemed relevant by the rater.)

Mental aspects should include four of the following factors:

- general intelligence level
- language development
- visual and auditory discrimination
- attention span
- memory span
- ability to listen to and retell a story
- ability to make inferences and to predict the outcome of a story
- interest in books and words
- knowledge of letter names
- left to right sequence of perception
- ability to interpret pictures

3. Students must also make mention of the maturation learning controversy. Can "readiness" be accelerated or must it wait upon time?

METEP LANGUAGE ARTS
Rating Scale for PC 28

The criterion is simply that the paper must make an admission that both word analysis techniques and memorizing whole words are necessary for a child to learn to read. The argument should probably deal with emphasizing one or the other with the exclusion of neither.

Don't pass if:

1. No specific examples are included.
2. No stand is taken.

Look for evidence of investigation into the question.

# CRITERIA FOR RATING PC'S

PC 1 Publishers' Evaluation

Pass if
- a. all three evaluations are submitted
- b. at least 2 different approaches are presented
- c. the discussion seems more than cursory

Don't pass if
- any of the above 3 criteria are not satisfied
- you know that the comments are irrelevant to the text

PC 2

Discussion of theories of beginning reading

Attendance is required on March 3rd for the discussions. A schedule will be posted listing times for discussions. Some evidence of background information should be displayed through the discussion process.

Guidlines to consider for discussion
- a. describe a basal system - does everyone have a common understanding?
- b. describe the uses and activities associated with the basal system in the public school
- c. how do basals differ, one from the other?
- d. suggest ways of improving use of basals
- e. discuss briefly each of the other approaches to beginning reading, using points 1 to 4 each time (Linguistic, Phonic, Experience, i/t/a, ndividualized, Programmed)
- f. discuss briefly the concepts of decoding and reading for meaning (or encoding). Discuss whether or not both are necessary for beginning reading.
- g. the above are suggested guidelines only. Use your own judgment when you see how the discussion is going.

Don't pass if
- student does not participate

PC 3 Readiness

Pass if
- a. the essay includes the following four areas: physical, social, emotional, mental in terms of teaching reading in the classroom.

b. physical aspects mentioned in the essay should include consideration of at least three of the following factors:
   -vision
   -hearing
   -speech
   -eye-hand coordination
   -general health

c. social aspects mentioned in the essay should include consideration of at least two of the following factors:
   -ability to participate actively and co-operatively in group activities
   -degree of self-reliance
   -the ability to share materials with classmates
   -the ability to wait for help from the teacher
   (or any two factors related to social maturity that the rater judges to have a significant bearing on the child's readiness.)

d. emotional aspects mentioned in the essay should include two of the following factors:
   -perseverance
   -stability
   -security
   (or any other two factors deemed relevant by the rater.)

e. mental aspects mentioned in the essay should include four of the following factors:
   -general intelligence level
   -language development
   -visual and auditory discrimination
   -attention span
   -ability to listen to and retell a story
   -ability to make inferences and to predict the outcome of a story
   -interest in books and words
   -knowledge of letter names
   -left to right sequence of perception
   -ability to interpret pictures

f. students should also make mention of the maturation learning controversy. Can "readiness" be developed and/or accelerated or must it wait upon time?

g. students should have completed one readiness check list (not all items must be filled out, but it should be apparent that the candidate has indeed observed a child.

h. four activities should be briefly suggested. Not too much detail is demanded here

Don't pass if

. the material seems irrelevant to the child

PC 4 Grouping

Pass if
a. information contains more than scores on the standardized tests
b. information is pertinent to the grouping done
c. information has been given for each of the 15 children
d. there is awareness shown that grouping can be done in different ways

Don't pass if
a. only standardized test scores are given as basis
b. grouping appears rigid
c. rationale is not applicable to grouping

PC 5 Informal Reading Inventory

Pass if
a. interview information sheet is filled out well
b. record form is filled out well
c. more than one book is used
d. there is a relationship between "words missed" and skills needs identified
e. "5 errors level" reached
f. more than cursory investigation

Don't pass if
all of the above criteria are not met

PC 6 Comprehension skills

Pass if
a. five of the comprehension skills are used
b. the questions deal with more than recall
c. the question bears some relationship to the skill
d. the answer doesn't reflect a rigid attitude

Don't pass if
a. all of the above are not met
b. a question requiring a "yes" or "no" answer is used
c. skills and answers are not indicated for each question

PC 7 Word analysis

Pass if
a. five children are described, in terms of their word analysis needs (the children may exhibit the same needs, or different ones). descriptions may be brief

b. three approaches, each different from the other, are used. The word analysis skill may be the same or different, but the approaches must be different (i.e. no three crossword puzzples or 3 word-type games. There must be three distinct approaches. Variety of materials is also important.
c. the activity should be enjoyable as well as informative

Don't pass if
a. all of the above are not satisfied
b. the activity is not appropriate to the skills need
c. the activity involves copying, or doing or writing something a repeated number of times

PC 8 Phonics

Pass if
a. student has passed the phonics test with a minimum score of 70% (deduct 1 point for each incorrect answer: give 2 points for each correct answer)
b. student presents in his oral or written presentation a minimum of 3 arguments or points of discussion or information demonstrating that the student understands the phonic approach, and how it differs from the others.

Don't pass if
both of the above have not been satisfied

PC 9 i/t/a

Pass if
a. student has ten or fewer errors in transcription
b. student gives at least three reasons for agreeing or disagreeing

Don't pass if
reasons student gives are not applicable to his point of view

PC 10 Linguistic approach

Pass if most of the following are done:
a. patterning is described
b. sequence of patterns is mentioned
c. the philosophy behind minimal use of illustrations is discussed
d. some mention of the correspondence between speech and reading is made
e. some notion of the reasons for the content is exhibited
f. a discussion of decoding and reading for meaning is presented

Don't pass if
- a. candidate does not clearly distinguish between the Linguistic approach and others
- b. at least four of the above are not discussed
- c. candidate shows no awareness that the vocabulary is controlled
- d. candidate confuses this with the Phonics approach

PC 11 Experience approach

Pass if
- a. student describes a group of five children in terms of their personality, interests, reading level, and reading needs.
- b. the three activities are each classifiable in a separate category (i.e., trip, films, discussion, experiences, books, experience charts, games, etc.)
- c. the activities are applicable to the descriptions of the children

Don't pass if
- all of the above are not carried out

PC 12 Individualized reading

Pass if
- a. all three principles, self-selection, pacing, and self-evaluation are clearly defined
- b. the hour-long session includes provisions for at least two of the following arrangements: teacher-child (one to one), small group, large group, whole class (teacher-to-class, or child-to-class, or small-group-to-class)

Don't pass if
- a. both of the above have not been satisfied
- b. the student seems confused about the principles and how to apply them

PC 13 Kits

Pass if
- a. candidate can operate machines competently without consulting directions
- b. description of situation in which selected materials would be used is appropriate

Don't pass if
   a. student makes more than 2 errors of operation
   b. student misunderstands purpose of kit or machine (i.e., SRA is not a total reading program)

PC 14 Special populations

Pass if
   a. paragraph describing population is included
   b. the described lessons are appropriate to the special population (i.e., not too fast for the retarded, not too specific or detailed for the gifted, not too "foreign" or non-urban for the urban, etc., etc., etc.)
   c. the lessons are in some logical order, and they follow, one from the other
   d. the activities are varied

Don't pass if
   a. all of the above are not satisfied
   b. any of the activities includes wirting something a specified number of times
   c. if the activities don't seem enjoyable as well as informative

PC 15 Finding relevant professional readings

Pass if
   a. ten journals, texts, other materials are selected: diverse topics or one topic may be selected
   b. the selected items are from diverse sources (at least three categories: periodicals, books, ERIC)
   c. the comments are personalized and thoughtful (if they are not someone else's opinion)

Don't pass if
   a. all of the above are not satisfied

PC 16 Evaluation

Pass if
   a. objective has been narrowed so that it can be measured
   b. objective is appropriate for class described (age, skills, interssts, etc.)
   c. method of evaluation is feasible, i.e., objectivity of evaluation, reasonable amount of time required, general manageability

d. the three methods are diverse. Some suggested approaches are: standardized or teacher made tests; interviews· coded observations; unobtrusive measures: frequency counts, role-playing; self-reports

Don't pass if

a. objective has not been narrowed enough to be specifically measured
b. objective is inappropriate for class, group, or individual described
c. alternatives will not succeed in measuring objectives
d. alternatives are actually all variations of one approach

PC 17 IQ

requires only that the student be present March 17 from 1:30-3:30 in Room 226-228

PC 18 Class library

Pass if

a. the books pertain to the class description
b. a variety of categories (at least 5) are included
c. the rationale is appropriate

Don't pass if

a. any of the above are not included
b. boys and their interests have not been considered

PC 19 Three ways of presenting a story

Pass if

a. activities are varied
b. activities are appropriate to the story

Don't pass if

. simply reading or telling the story is suggested

PC 20 Telling a story aloud

Pass if

a. student looks at audience more than at book
b. student varies volume of voice (loud, soft, medium)
c. student projects voice to listener (rater sits at other end of room to hear reading)
d. student looks pleasant, or at least not too tense
e. student varies voice quality, tone, pitch (not monotonous)

f. student projects the meaning
g. student reads fluently

Don't pass if
a. student mumbles
b. student speaks in monotone
c. students fails to project meaning
d. student fails to sound involved in the reading
e. student seldom, if ever, looks up
f. student reads in too choppy a fashion

PC 21 Creative writing

Pass if
a. class description and activities are pertinent to each other
b. activities are geared for the children, not the teacher

Don't pass if
a. activities show rigidity
b. activities don't pertain to students' descriptions

PC 22 Spelling

Pass if candidate
a. groups words that might logically be taught together
b. pays attention to meaning as well as analysis
c. suggests ways for students to use words
d. suggests appropriate activities for the described students
e. addresses himself or herself specifically to one or more of the goals

Don't pass if candidate
a. has students write words a number of times each
b. pays no attention to meaning or relevance
c. does not group at least a few words for teaching together
d. does not have a logical or interesting sequence of activities
e. does not use varied experiences for the activities

PC 23 Listening

Pass if
a. student has selected an objective pertinent to the class
b. student has described two diverse but appropriate activities for the objective

Don't pass if
a. activities are inappropriate for the class or for the objective
b. if either of the activities includes copying, or

doing some acitivity a specified number of times
c. the activity does not look enjoyable as well as informative

PC 24 Speech

Pass if
a. the objective is appropriate for the class
b. the three approaches are diverse and appropriate for both the objective and the class

Don't pass if
a. both of the above are not satisfied
b. the activities are not enjoyable as well as informative
c. either of the activities includes copying, or doing some activity a specified number of times

PC 25 Dramatics

Pass if
a. the activities are pertinent to the class
b. the activities are used as vehicles for teaching some area of the content curriculum (science, math, a reading skill, social studies, etc.)
c. at least one activity is informal (i. e., doesn't require a script, or formal directed rehearsals, or a great many "trappings" or, even, sometimes, an audience)

Don't pass if
a. all of the above are not satisfied
b. the activities are rigid
c. the activities are inappropriate for the content or the class

PC 26 Grammar

Pass if
a. an awareness of the general philosophy and format of both traditional and linguistic grammar is exhibited
b. the activities teach some form of structure without making use of a text

Don't pass if
both of the above are not satisfied

PC 27 Handwriting

Pass if
a. the lesson achieves one goal
b. the lesson is well organized

c. the handwriting is legible (in terms of size, shape, and consistency)

Don't pass if

a. the lesson is too complicated
b. a combination (rather than only one form) of manuscript and cursive are used

Feasibility Study of a Performance-Based Teacher Education Curriculum in the Language Arts (May, 1970)

Masha Rudman

B.A., Hunter College

M.S., Hunter College

Directed by: James M. Cooper

The feasibility study was conducted under the provisions of a model elementary teacher education grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The study authored by Masha Rudman contains the goals, rationale, and curriculum of the program. Mary Alice Wilson designed and conducted the evaluation. Rudman and Wilson worked together in the management of both the Fall, 1969, feasibility portion of the program and the Spring, 1970, follow-up. Rudman's study primarily deals with the feasibility semester, but chapter four and the appendix contain materials relevant to the follow-up curriculum.

Chapter one contains an overview of and rationale for a performance-based teacher education program. Sources are cited for developing a curriculum based on educational objectives and multiple instructional alternatives. The goals and a brief history of the study are also provided. The goals are divided into categories for the student and the

program itself and are outlined as follows:

I. Student

A. Attitudes

1. The student will demonstrate

a. self-awareness of preferences in learning and teaching styles (including pacing, sequence, and approaches)

b. acceptance of the validity of other learning and teaching styles

c. willingness to attempt more than one learning and teaching style i.e. willingness to take risks

d. commitment to seek and use a multiplicity of learning and teaching styles

B. Abilities

1. The student will demonstrate

a. proficiency in the language arts: reading, writing, listening, speaking

b. knowledge of the process of each area within the language arts (this entails the ability to decide which skills an act requires and whether or not these skills are sequential)

c. ability to assess the student's level of development and to diagnose his skills needs, using both formal and informal procedures. The abilities to

recognize strengths as well as needs, to communicate this information, and to keep this procedure continuous rather than sporadic are included in this goal

d. knowledge of a variety of approaches and materials available to each area of the language arts (such as linguistic, phonic, basal, programmed, experience, individualized, and i/t/a materials for teaching reading.)

e. ability to select from the many available materials and approaches, or to generate new ones to satisfy the needs of the students

II. Program

A. Provide an overview of the content of the elementary language arts curriculum

B. Provide a structure for constant reexamination of the theoretical bases, content, and approaches in the language arts

C. Provide a model for the learner's future behavior

D. Permit the participants to achieve a number of unspecified but probable behaviors such as:

1. Pace his own learning appropriately
2. Experiment with different learning environments and materials
3. generate new approaches for his own learning

4. Develop a particular interest in the language arts, leading to a specialization in the area

Chapter two includes a review of literature pertinent to curriculum development, instructional alternatives, and use of media in teacher education. The review of literature dealing with the content area of language arts is contained in chapter three. The curriculum for the feasibility study was included in this chapter as well as a summary of the participants' comments and suggestions. Chapter four represents the outcome of the suggestions offered in chapter three: it contains the follow-up curriculum.

Conclusions and suggestions for future research are presented in chapter five. The conclusions indicate that it is pedagogically feasible to design and offer a curriculum to future teachers based on performance and offering multiple instructional routes to the achievement of these performances.

Feasibility Study of a Performance-Based Teacher Education Curriculum in the Language Arts (May, 1970)

Masha Rudman

B.A., Hunter College

M.S., Hunter College

Directed by: James M. Cooper

The feasibility study was conducted under the provisions of a model elementary teacher education grant from the U.S. Office of Education. The study authored by Masha Rudman contains the goals, rationale, and curriculum of the program. Mary Alice Wilson designed and conducted the evaluation. Rudman and Wilson worked together in the management of both the Fall, 1969, feasibility portion of the program and the Spring, 1970, follow-up. Rudman's study primarily deals with the feasibility semester, but chapter four and the appendix contain materials relevant to the follow-up curriculum.

Chapter one contains an overview of and rationale for a performance-based teacher education program. Sources are cited for developing a curriculum based on educational objectives and multiple instructional alternatives. The goals and a brief history of the study are also provided. The goals are divided into categories for the student and the

program itself and are outlined as follows:

I. Student

A. Attitudes

1. The student will demonstrate

a. self-awareness of preferences in learning and teaching styles (including pacing, sequence, and approaches)

b. acceptance of the validity of other learning and teaching styles

c. willingness to attempt more than one learning and teaching style i.e. willingness to take risks

d. commitment to seek and use a multiplicity of learning and teaching styles

B. Abilities

1. The student will demonstrate

a. proficiency in the language arts: reading, writing, listening, speaking

b. knowledge of the process of each area within the language arts (this entails the ability to decide which skills an act requires and whether or not these skills are sequential)

c. ability to assess the student's level of development and to diagnose his skills needs, using both formal and informal procedures. The abilities to

recognize strengths as well as needs, to communicate this information, and to keep this procedure continuous rather than sporadic are included in this goal

d. knowledge of a variety of approaches and materials available to each area of the language arts (such as linguistic, phonic, basal, programmed, experience, individualized, and i/t/a materials for teaching reading.)

e. ability to select from the many available materials and approaches, or to generate new ones to satisfy the needs of the students

II. Program

A. Provide an overview of the content of the elementary language arts curriculum

B. Provide a structure for constant reexamination of the theoretical bases, content, and approaches in the language arts

C. Provide a model for the learner's future behavior

D. Permit the participants to achieve a number of unspecified but probable behaviors such as:

1. Pace his own learning appropriately
2. Experiment with different learning environments and materials
3. generate new approaches for his own learning

4. Develop a particular interest in the language arts, leading to a specialization in the area

Chapter two includes a review of literature pertinent to curriculum development, instructional alternatives, and use of media in teacher education. The review of literature dealing with the content area of language arts is contained in chapter three. The curriculum for the feasibility study was included in this chapter as well as a summary of the participants' comments and suggestions. Chapter four represents the outcome of the suggestions offered in chapter three: it contains the follow-up curriculum.

Conclusions and suggestions for future research are presented in chapter five. The conclusions indicate that it is pedagogically feasible to design and offer a curriculum to future teachers based on performance and offering multiple instructional routes to the achievement of these performances.